Rusticus ad *Clericum*

OR, THE

PLOW-MAN

REBUKING THE

PRIEST,

In ANSWER to

Verus Patroclus,

Wherein, The False-hoods, Forgeries, Lies, Perversions, and Self-contradictions, of WILLIAM JAMISON are detected.

By JOHN ROBERTSON.

Utque devitent verum
Nebulas, Manes & Chimeras aucupunt
Pariuntque Monstra, queis nec est pes nec caput
Ceu vacua Magnos æratinnitus cient:

Prov: 4. 16. *For they sleep not eexcept they have done mischief, and their sleep is taken away, except they cause some to fall.*
17. *For they eat the Bread of Wickedusss, and drink the Wine of Violence.*

Printed in the Year. 1694.

Ruſticus ad *Clericus*,

OR THE

PLOW-MAN

REBUKING THE

PRIEST,

In Anſwer to *VERUS PATROCLUS*, &c.

FRIEND,

AS Our Neighbours and Countrey-Men, who are acquainted with our Principles and Practiſes, know us to be *Lovers of all Mankind*, ſuch as *ſeek the Good of All*, and *the prejudice of none*; So we have no ſuch Enemies as the *Clergie* now Regnant, and ſome of their bigotted Diſciples, whom they have bewitched with fair words, and ſmooth ſpeeches, to believe all they ſay

without examining, whether it be true or false.

This Tribe of *Lying Levites*, have now for many years made use of all the unworthy Methods their Wit and Malice could invent, to Blacken, Defame, Slander, and Misrepresent Us; This is no New thing: It is but the Doctrine of *Demetrius* the Silver Smith; For they well know that if people were taught to believe according to the Scriptures, that GOD would teach his people himself, And that he who knoweth not Christ in him, to teach him, is a Reprobate: That they who know him not thus, let in to the Conscience, to purge it from deadworks, and to Reign as King, Lord, and Lawgiver, are at best but nominal Christians; Than certainly their sordid Trade of Preaching for hyre would be at an end, for upholding whereof, all his bustle is made in the World.

All their clamours concerning the Scriptures, Christ, Trinity, (so called) original sin, *&c.* Are but meer pretences: For let an Angel from Heaven teach any thing contrary to the *Westminster* Confession and Catechisms, though never so consonant to the Holy Scriptures, he must expect no better acceptance from these men

Men, then to be branded with the odious name of Heretick, as if they alone had been commissionate to sett bounds to the Faith of all Mankind.

My Reader must not expect from me a long and Rhetorical Introduction, who have been more accustomed to the Plough then the Pen, for nigh Thirty Years together, I was never at Court, and but seldom in the City; And therefore if I treat mine Adversary with any less *decorum*, then he may suppose to be due to a man of his Robe: I hope my Rustick Education will excuse me, and the rather because I have little or no knowledge of him, but what I gather from his Book, which at first view gave me no good Character of him, by his falling foul upon the Bishop of *Andrews*. Certainly no generous man will strick a fallen Foe: And although he would insinuate, that he did not complain for stopping his book; yet is evident that he exposeth the Bishop and his Brethren to the Fate of his Predecessor, if the Rabble would but take the Allarum. The next thing I learn of him, is, that he is a *Presbyterian Preacher*, (Tho his seeking a License from the Prelate of *Andrews*, be no great sign of his Zeal, and seems to intimate

intimate, that if the Prelate ſhould get a new Throw for the Chair, our Author might be brought to cry *peccavi Pater, &c.*) If information hold, and if ſuch, then conſequently a ſworn Enemy to all Mankind, except thoſe of his own Fraternity, by the *Solemn League* and *Covenant*; Yea, his being a Clergie-man is dangerous, *For* (as *Machiavel* tells us) *they have been now for more than a thouſand years forming and ſetting up an intereſt, diſtinct and ſeparate from all the reſt of Mankind.* And when the *Popiſh Clergie* were juſtly extruded becauſe of their Cruelty and Inſolency: Lo, here we have their Succeſſours no leſs inſolent, ctuel, and covetous, if they had but power; And this was foretold by the ſame *Machiavel* in his Letter to *Zenob.* page 28. who ſaith thus, *But this I will propheſie, before I conclude, That if Princes ſhall perform this buſineſs by halves, and leave any root of this Clergie, or Prieſt-craft, as it is now in the ground.* Or if that Famous Reformer fled ſome years ſince out of *Piccardie* to *Geneva*, who is of ſo great Renown for Learning and Parts, and who promiſes us ſo perfect a Reformation, ſhall not in his model wholly extirpate this ſort of Men: Then I ſay, I muſt foretell, *That as well the Magiſtrate as*

this

this Workman, will find themſelves deceived in their Expectations, And that the leaſt *Fibra of this plant will overrun again the whole Vineyard of the LORD, and turn to a diffuſive* Papacie *in everie Diocie, perhaps in every Pariſh, &c.* Whether we have ſeen this propheſie fulfilled by the Diſciples of the ſame Reformer *Calvine*, let the unbyaſſed Reader judge.

The next thing in his *præludium* (all his work being like a Stage-play,) is, That albeit this Knight Errant, with his *Aebillean* Armour, and *Titanian* Boldneis, (words borrowed from himſelf, from the Blind Poet) *hath bid Defyance to all that profeſs Chriſtianity*, And *hath concluded them all* (except his own way) *Hereticks*. Yet in oppoſition to the *Quakers*, he calleth in for *Auxibary* Forces, a *Prelatick Preacher*, and an *Independent*, and chiefly an *Anabaptiſt*, (whom in his book he calls wicked and abominable,) as the *Phariſes* joyned with the *Sadducees*, *Herodians* and *Romans* to crucifie *CHRIST*. As for the *Prelatick Clergie*, he ſaith, *it is infected with the Hemlock of Pelagianiſm*: And in his Frontiſpeece, he hath told you their Fate, that is, *They are to be rejected*. But what more? Is then no Civil Sanction follows upon *Presbyterian*

Ex-

Excommunication? If it want the Sting it will be nothing regarded; But of old it was not so, For the first step was to *Curse*! then *Out-law*, next *proscribe*; And if brought in alive, then there was in store *prisons*, *Forfeitures*, *Banishments*, *Axes*, and *Halters* for *Heretiques*: And our Author is so much delighted in cutting *Juglar Veins*, that it seems he covets the office; But Blessed be the LORD, the Civil Magistrats are now become wiser than to be the Clergies Bravoes; And their long experience of the HONEST and PEACEABLE PRINCIPLES of the *QUAKERS*, hath confirmed the Magistrate in a better Opinion of Them.

As to the Buffoonrie of his Adulatory Epistle to his Patron, I shall only say, that he hath rather affronted then obliged his Patron, by espousing him to such a Cast-Mistress, as is the Controversie against the Quakers, which never Man yet undertook, but came off with Disgrace. After he hath sufficiently (and a little more then become a *Protestant*) rated the Episcopal Party) he falls to the Buffoonry of his Dedication; About the end whereof, he hath these words, *Go on therefore my Lord*, espousing the Cause of the

the true *Proteſtant* Intereſt, in oppoſition to *Popery*, and whatſoever hath attendancy thereunto: By this tendency he certainly intends not ſo much the *Quakers*, as the *Epiſcopal Church*, which may be ſeen in the 15*th*. page of his Dedication. But he muſt give me leave to tell him, that the *Epiſcopal Church* of *England* hath done, and ſuffered more for the *Proteſtant Intereſt* than all the *Presbyterians* in the World; And the three hundreth Lives laid down in the dayes of Queen *Mary*, were of more ſervice to the *Proteſtant* intereſt, than an hundred Thouſand loſt by the *Solemn League* and *Covenant*. And yet both *Prelatick* and *Preſbyterian* Churches departed from the *Proteſtant* Principles, in that they have firſt ſet up to themſelves an abſolute Authority in matter of Faith and Worſhip. 2*ly*, That they have not contented themſelves with Excommunication, but have perſecuted ſuch as could not comply. And 3*ly*, By this perſecution thy have rendred themſelves guilty of all the *Apoſtacie*, *Hypocriſie*, and *Diſſimulation* of ſuch have as complyed out of meer fear: which three things, as none of the leaſt cauſes of ſeperation have been charged upon the Church of *Rome*: And frequently caſts in her teeth by all *Proteſtants*: Yet hath the Ruling

Clergie

Clergie of every *Protestant* Church followed her footsteps, how soon they got Power: For this see a paper caled the third part of *Naked truth*, Printed 1681. I need not here mention the many troubles, Wars, Devastations and Miseries brought upon *Europe* by the *Romish* Clergie these 1000 years bypast: But to come nearer home, and in our own Age; Have we not seen the execrable Murther of One King, the banishment of Another, the loss of an Hundred Thousand *Lives*, and infinite Treasure, the ruine of our Native Country, not yet recovered; And all this to satisfie Ambition, and avance of a contentious Clergie: Yea, and such contention as amounted to no more than, whither the Precels of their Assembly should be constant or moveable; And whither he should be called Moderator or Bishop, which King *Charles* the first calls the Skirts or Suburbs of Religion. And yet alace! Men have so mancipated their Judgements to the dictats of the Clergie, they own that there is great cause to fear a Relapse.

I shall earnestly desire my Countrymen to consider what brought us to the present condition we are in, but the artifices

fices of the Clergie? The Popiſh Clergie having got a King of their own Religion, have inceſſantly cryed on him, that the Churches, Colledges, Rents, Revenues, Tythes, and Benefices, were of right theirs: And that it was Sacriledge to keep them out of Poſſeſſion. The *Epiſcopal* Clergie had the Reformation to plead, the ſad ſufferings of their predeceſſors, and the Law of the Nation, their own piety, and Moderation (as they pretended) But the *Presbyterians* think they have been but lately put from it by the Prelates, they had gained it by the Sword, and that *Major Vis* is a good Right; and they have been ſtill attempting it ſince the year 1666: And clamouring that the Nation is under a Solemn Oath by the Covenant to extirpate all others, and eſtabliſh them: So that we are brought into this preſent confuſion, only to ſatisfie the ambition and avarice of the Clergie; The Honour and the wealth is the Bone of contention, ſettled Revenues, Tythes, and forced Mantainance: and while the Civil Magiſtrates patronizeth any one of the three in Poſſeſſion of thoſe; We need expect no quiet, but take away the Bone and the Dogs will ceale.

Having done with his Dedication, I

must

must tell thee thou shalt expect none from me, Being ——

Nullius addictus Jurare in verba Magistri.

But I must look back to his Frontispeece, where he begins with *Verus Patroclus.*

What he intends by this, We must consider, Either he intends the *Quakers*, his *own Book*, or *himself.*

If he intends the *Quakers*, he is greatly mistaken, For (if we may believe Tradition) *Patroclus* was a Souldier at the siege of *Troy*, and borrowed *Achilles* Armour, to fight against *Hector*, by whom he was killed. Now the *Quakers* are so far from borrowing Carnal Weapons, *That they have beat their own swords into plow shears, &c.* and resolve to learn War no more.

If he intend his *own Book*, he hath yet erred, for we read, that *Patroclus* was a very man like one of us, and had tongue and teeth as well as our Author.

But if he intends *himself*, I wonder how he calls himself, the *True patroclus*; But it seems that by reading *Virgils* 4th. *Eclogue*, he hath dreamed, that *Plato's* great year was come, *Atque iterum ad Trojam Magnus mittetur Achilles*; And that he is the very *patroclus*, so being assured of his Fate, he attacks the whole *Christian World with great confidence*

confidence. If therefore I some times call him *patroclus*, some times *our Author*, and some times *mine Adversary*, I hope my Reader will understand me.

He begins his preface to the Reader with a jealousie about the acceptance of his Book (not without cause) He had told us before in his Dedication that it could not be judged altogether *superfluous*, Because of the *Hemlock of pelagianism*, wherewith the Bulk of the *Prelatick Clargie is infected:* Yet fears after all this it may be called an *Iliad* after *Homer*, &c. And therefore that his *Babie* may not be neglected, he tells the causes of its production over again, and tho he told us it was designed for his *Patron* as a Testimony of his gratitude for his education: Yet here it comes to be a Publick concern, and he gives us *three Fathers* who have begot this *Monstrous Birth* upon one *Mother*, his *Brain*, *Viz.* The *danger* of this; *deadly disease* The *proximoity* of it, and the *readiness* of its *possitions* to *broach Books.*

It seems he means Truth to be this dangerous disease, but it is so to none but such *pedantick Chaplines* as he who gets their *Bread by lies*; Nor is it dangerous to any but the *Clergie*, because its *followers decry their Tyths*, *their*

their Belly, their God. As for its *proximity*, I know no ſober man but likes their Neighbourhood, even the moderate among the *Epiſcopal* Teachers. And as to their *Broaching of Books*: This is great impudence who was troubling him? Hath he ſeen any controverſie written by the *Quakers* ſince the Year 1679. And now when the LORD had moved the hearts of the *Civil Magiſtrats* to give them a little reſpite from their ſad ſufferings; Behold this *Gladiator* attacks them (and by all the lies, Forgeries, and falſe Accuſations that he can invent to defame) provokes them again to enter the Liſts in the defence of that Bleſſed Teſtimony, which will for ever ſtand over him, & all ſuch forgers.

And how unwilling we have been to broach Books, may appear by our long delay to anſwer this Bable: Yea, had not ſome of their *Preachers at Aberdeen*, and in the *Weſt*, vainly boaſted that it was unanſwerable: We had not yet thought it worthy to be noticed.

The next thing that occurs, is that *he accuſes the Nation of negligence*, for not *comparing the Doctrine of the Quakers* with the Scriptures. Oh! That he or any elſe could awaken them to that diligence, and that they

they would put on that Nobillity commended in the *Bereans*, and come to an impartial ſearch, not as *Patroclus*, *Faldo*, and *Hicks*, repreſent them, but as they are indeed, But Reader, he intends nothing leſs: For after all thy pains, except thou will implicitly allow his Character of the *Quakers*, and take his ſenſe of the *Quakers*, he will be ſure to Stigmatiſe thee for a Heretick. All their clamouring the Scriptures, the Scriptures is but a meer Jugle, its their own Gloſs they intend. *Interpres loquitur Litera Sacra filet.* A little after he tells us, *ignoti nulla cupido*, very true, for if the principles of the diſpyſed *Quakers* were but well known, *Patroclus* Book would be hiſſed out of Doors: And therefore in the end of this Epiſtle, he ſaith, touch not, taſte not, handle not the unclean thing; ſtrange Doctrine! try, and try not; I have told you what they are, ſtop your ears and run upon them.

The reſt of his Epiſtle (being all *Satyr*, compoſed of Railing Lies, Forgeries, and falſe inſinuations,) I omit; he bringing me no better proof for them then his own confident aſſertion, or rather impudent calumny in theſe words: in a word, I ſay, that

That as the Doctrine of the Quakers is a heap of none such Blasphemies, so their defences are meet subterfuges.

Very well *Patroclus*, this is borrowed Armour indeed, and that from the Pope in *Cathedra*. *I say, ergo, verum est*: Take his word Reader, and his book is superfluous; This is no humble confidence, as he elsewhere words it: But if *Quevedo* was puzelled to distinguish betwixt a *Pope and Presbyter in Hell*, he would not have been cleared of his doubts by reading this passage.

And now to his Book.

CHAPTER FIRST.

Of the Holy SCRIPTURES.

HE begins with a citation of Scripture, *A good Name is better then precious Ointment*, the more shame for *Patroclus*, who hath laboured to rob the *Quakers* of it; by all the black-

mouth

Mouth'd detractions he could invent to defame them.

His first charge is, *That the Quakers deny that the Scriptures are or ought to be called the Word of GOD.*

Answer, This appears to me but a meer *Logomachie* in *Petroelus*; For that the word *Logos* is diversly translated in *Scripture* we confess; As Preaching, 1 *Cor:* 1. 18. Utterance. 1 *Cor:* 1. 5. Speech *Col:* 4. 6. And divers otherwayes. Now that the *Scriptures* in such senses may be called *Logos*; That is, the *speech*, *discourse*, or words of the *Logos*, or *Word of GOD*, which he spoke to the Patriarchs, Prophets, and Apostles, and by them recorded for the benefite of the Church, we willingly grant: But *the Word of GOD* being a Name so peculiarly attributed to *CHRIST JESUS*, who being a *Jealous GOD, will not give his Glory to another*; Out of meer tenderness of Conscience we can singly from the bottom of our hearts say, and not in the least from any disesteem or disparagement of the *Scriptures* (*which are our delight to meditate in, and peruse often*) do we scruple to give them that *Essential Title* or *Name of Christ*, it being so solemnly and frequently by the Scriptures themselves attributed to the *Son of God*. As

in that remarkable place. *John* 1. *In the Beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God, and the Word was made Flesh* (which can no wayes be said of the Scriptures.) *And there be Three that bear Record in Heaven, The Father, The Word, and the Spirit.* And his *Name* is called *the Word of God.*

Now let any sober unbyassed Christian People judge, whether we deserve all these black Epithets this Author loads us with, meerly for being tender of Attributing the *Sacred Name of the Creator*, to a Creature.

But he bringeth a bundle of Citations to as little purpose as the *Westminster Confession* uses to do in such case, As R. B. hath remarked in the end of his Confession of Faith. The Impertinency of which Citations may be clearly apparent by inserting the Word *Scripture* in place of the *Word of the Lord.* As *Numbers* 3. 16. And *Moses numbred them, according to the Word of the Lord: Patrocles* sense is, and *Moses* numbred them according to the Scriptures, whereas yet there was none extant: Second is, *Deuter.* 5. and 5. *I stood between the Lord and you at that time to shew you the Word of the Lord,* Now how impertinent would it be to say, That *Moses* had the *Bible* in his hand to shew the *Israelites.* Among

Among all the rest of his Citations, he lays most hold on *Hoseæ* 1, and 2. *The Beginning of the Word of the* LORD *by* Hosea. This sayeth he, is a Denying of the *Eternity of the Son of God*; But how grosly he erreth here may be seen above by divers Acceptations we grant of the *Word*; As in *Psalm* 19. 2, The same *Word* signifieth *Speech*. Now to take this *Word* for the *Scripture* would be a grosly lye; For it was not the Beginning of the Scripture much having been written before. And therefore the true meaning of this place to all single hearted ones, is clearly the time when *Christ*, the *Word* of the Lord began to speak to *Hosea*. Or as the *Latin* hath it, *Principium loquendi Domini in Hosea.*

There are no more of his citations that seem to have any weight but that of *Mark.* 7. 13 compared with verse 10. I shall begin at the 9. *And he said unto them, full well ye reject the Commandment of GOD, that ye may keep your own Traditions.* Verse 10. *For Moses said, Honour thy Father and thy Mother*, &c. Verse 13. *Making the Word of GOD of none effect.*

Now that this *Word* mentioned by the Evangelist was one of the *Ten Words* spoken on Mount *Sinai*, we do not deny,

And that every Commandement Precept, Promise, or Threatning in the Scripture, is a *Word of God*, we fully acknowledge: And so all he can make of this is, That the fifth Commandment here meaned is one of the *Ten Words* that came from *Christ* the *Word* the *Eternal Son of God*.

And whereas he quibles upon the word *Per eminentiam*, or by way of Eminency: The fifth Commandment before mentioned shall furnish us an Example. *The King of Scotland* is an Epithet predicated of the chief Magistrat; Now I ask him, if this Epithet can be predicated *per eminentiam* of any other Man, Book, or thing in the Nation without Treason? And see if his Properly and Improperly will serve him here. The very *Committee of Estates*, altho it exercised the *Regal Power* in the *Late Rebellion* did not ulurp the Title of King, tho they were a little too familiar with his Authority and Person. But I hope hereafter *Patroclus* will be a little more tender of the Titles of the *King of kings*. Having granted the Contraverſy *in Terminis*.

For in page 3. He granteth that *Christ is the Essential and Substantial Word of God, The principal Dictator of the Mind of God*. And that

that the Scriptures are a discourse composed of Letters and Syllables. The first he calls *improper*, the second *proper*: But how pertinently the Reader may consider: If that which is *Essential* and *Substantial* to a thing be not proper to it, he may tell us with the next, what is more proper then the *Essence* or *Substance* of a thing is. Henceforth according to him, we must call the Beams or Rayes coming from the *Sun*, properly the Sun; But the Sun himself from whence they all come must be improperly so called.

And now to shew, That this is a meer strife about words, I shall summ up this contraversie thus, R: B: saith, *Christ is the Word of GOD*: Patroclus saith, *Christ* is the *Essential* and *Substantial Word of GOD*: R: B: saith, *The Scriptures are a True and Faithful Declaration of the* Mind *and Will of GOD, revealed by the Word of GOD to his Servants*: Patroclus saith, *Christ* is the *Principal Declarer* of the *Mind of GOD*. R: B: saith, *The Scriptures are the Words of GOD*. Patroclus saith, *The Scriptures are a discourse composed of Letters and Syllables*.

Now let the Reader judge where the Contraversy lyes.

Page 4. About the end, He saith (after some

ome scurrilous Language) That the *Quakers* deny, *The Title of Gospel to the Books of Matthew, Mark, Luke and John*; And then falls to hard words again, saying The defence of this wicked and bold Contradiction of the Scriptures, *William Penn* undertakes in his Rejoinder to *John Faldo* page 117. Where observe first, That he asserteth it a Contradiction of Scripture; When he hath brought no Scripture seeming to contradict what is said. But *Mark* 1. 1. Which shall be considered in its place. Observe 2*dly*, That to oppose Truth, The *Presbyterians* and *Independants* can join issue, (like *Herod* and *Pontius Pilate*) Notwithstanding all the Clamours we have heard in *Aberdeen* about the Text, *Holiness becomes Thy House, O LORD*, &c.

To prove this assertion, *William Penn* produceth Scripture, Reason, and the Authority of Ancient and Modern Writters. *First*, The Gospel is the Power of GOD to Salvation: To which he Answereth, That the Scriptures may as well be called the Power of GOD to Salvation, as the Gospel. Here he hath granted the Scriptures to be one thing, and the Gospel another, and must come to his Diversity of

of Acceptations properly and improperly, again for he hath done with it.

He sayes page 5th. It was the same Doctrine which the Apostles preached and committed to Writting. Who denyes this, or what saith it for him, more then Luke 1. c. 1. A Declaration of these things which are most firmly believed amongst us: And this no Quaker ever denyed. But Secondly, He tells us, that by Power of GOD to Salvation, can be understood no other thing but the mean Organ or Instrument whereby GOD exerteth or putteth forth his Power to the saving of Sinners. And again in page 6. He saith the Power of GOD, That is GOD Himself; See the Mans confusion and self contradiction.

In the next place *William Penn* gives him another Scripture, *Rev:* 14. 6. Which is nothing to *Patrocles*, except it suite with his mind; For after a few Quibles, he saith the Doctrine contained in these Books is the same with, and therefore no less everlasting then the Gospel proclaimed by the Angel: This *William Penn* granteth, That they are a Declaration or Narrative of the Gospel, and that the thing they declare of is the Gospel.

Page 5th. About the end, He cites *William*

William Penn saying, The Gospel is *Glad Tidings*; But *Matthew*, *Mark*, &c. are but Narratives, &c. and not *Glad tidings*: Which last Words he hath added like his Brethren, *Hicks* and *Foldo*. And in page. 6th He saith, They are divers Narratives of the same Doctrine, and all which Books contain the *Glad tidings*, &c. Yet after all this, he falls a railing, Therefore I shall set down *William Penn's* Words, That the Reader may Judge how he is dealt with.

William Penns Rejoynder page 118 Which is further proven by the signification of the Word GOSPEL, To wit, *Glad tidings*, which are to be understood of the coming of Him that was the Saviour of the World; Of whole blessed Appearance and wonderful Transactions, the Scriptures are but Narratives: Besides one of their Authors (*Luke*) expresly calls them a Declaration consequently not the Gospel thereby declared of; Which Definition *Peter Martyre* that superintendant Reformer in *England*, chooseth of all others, *part.* 1. *cap.* 6. of his common places. *Tertulian* calls the Scriptures, *Instrumenta Doctrinæ*, That is, Instruments of Doctrine; And the New Testament Writings, *Evangelicum*

gelicum Instrumentum: And *Matthew* he calls a Faithful Commentator of the Gospel. *Chrysostome* being required to swear upon the Gospel, both denyed those Histories to be the Gospel and to swear at all, *&c.* Now let the Witness of GOD in the Conscience of the Reader, compare this with the *6th.* page of *Patroclus*, and Judge whether his contempt, railing and reproach, hath been hereby deserved. I shall only say, *The LORD forgive him.*

To conclude this Matter, he brings one Scripture, *Mark* 1. 1. After he hath asserted a great untruth, and then railed violently upon it, *Telesh*, That *William Penn* denyeth that the Books of *Matthew*, *Mark*, *Luke*, and *John*, contain *Gladtidings*; Whereas *William Penn* hath three times over called them Narratives, or Declarations of the Gospel, or *Gladtidings*: This is great Impudence but common to Men of his Coat.

Then from the Scripture before cited, he bringeth forth a Dilemma, which is easily answered by a distinction betwixt the History and the Mystery of the Gospel, which he might have considered before he had given us all this Trash. But to let him see what follows upon his sense

of

of these Scriptures he abuseth, I will adventure (for once) to sylogize thus.

The Books of *Matthew*, *Mark*, *Luke*, and *John*, are the Gospel.

But the Gospel is the Power of God, &c.

Ergo, The Books aforesaid, Are the Power of GOD, *&c.*

And again.

The Books before mentioned are the Power of GOD.

But the Power of GOD, is GOD Himself.

Ergo, The Books before mentioned are GOD Himself.

I have here inserted nothing but what he hath asserted *in terminis*, in his 4. 5. 6. pages, where marke that he calls it abominable *Swank-Feldianism* to understand, *Rom.* 1. 16. any other wayes then of the Books before mentioned.

Page 6th. About the end, he begins with a kind of Scolding Oratory, to defame the *Quakers*, Saying, They cloath the Scriptures with base Epithets and contemptible Aspersions, as the Heathens did cloath the Christians with Beasts skins, that the Lions and other wild Beasts might the more rea-

dily

dily destroy them. All this yet poor Man not minding the Words of our Saviour to his Predecessors the *Pharisees* (who were no less Exalters of the Scriptures then he or his Brethren) *Matth.* 23. 29. *For in cruelty ye are nothing inferiour to them.*

Now let us see what he hath for this matter, first, the *Quakers* call the *Scriptures* the letter.

Answer, so doth the *Scriptures* themselves, in distinction from the Spirit, As 2 *Corinthians* 3. 6. Except *Patrocinium* intend to turn *Socinian*, who understood this place of *Scripture* to be meant of the Gospel, or *Scriptures* of the *New Testament*, as may be seen in the *Cracovian* Catechism, *Page* 162, 163. Asserting the Holy Spirit to be the *Ipsum Evangelium*, and at best to be but a certain hope of Eternal life promised to us.

Secondly, (they call the *Scriptures* Writings, Is not this plain *Scots* for *Scriptures*? Or what difference is there betwixt *Scriptures* and Writings? It seems the fault is, that the word is not a little Latinized; But every *Quaker* is not so good a *Linguist* as *Patrocinius*.

His third charge is, that the *Quakers* call them

them a letter, about the meaning, where-of now two are agreed.

Now *Patrocles*, I pray thee, for once deal ingenuously with me, and omitting many other instances, answer only these two; First, if the *Scriptures* be so plain and obvious to every well disposed intellect (as your party word it) how came the whole Ministry of *Scotland* to differ so farr in the year 1650, about so easie a case, as whether it was Lawful for the *Malignants* to fight for their Native Country against a Forraign Enemie.

And *secondly*, It is well known, that about the year 1661, & after divers *Presbyterian* Ministers were suspended from the exercise of their Ministry, who notwithstanding did not submit, but continued preaching, and gathered to themselves congregations in the desart to the great disturbance of the Nation. On the other hand in the year 1689, several hundreds of the *Episcopal* Ministers have been suspended, and their Flocks left destitute; Yet all of them have submitted and are silent. Now seeing both parties acknowledge the same *Scripture*: Tell me I pray thee whether they be agreed about the meaning, and bring me plain *Scripture* to decide

these

these two contraversies, *Et eris mihi Magnus Apollo.*

After this in *Page* 7, he falls upon citations, where he promiscuously, and at all adventures, cites *Hicks and Baldo*, upon whole Bankrupt Faith he layes no small stress. I always doubted *Parsons* to be no found *Presbyterian*: For sure they who could not allow *Malignants* to fight for their Native Country, would never allowes Sectaries to contend for the Faith, which certainly is more Pr ecious then all outward things: But especially they being men who by their open forgeries and falsehoods have forefeited their Credit with all Honest Men:

I shall be at the pains with one or two of them, tho they deserve no notice.

In *Page* 8, he cites one N: L: Cited by *Hicks* and saith, he evinced by him against *Penn*, That if the Bible were burnt, as good an one might be writ, these words *Hicks* saith, were spoken by *N: L:* To one he knows very well, upon publishing this in his Book; *N: L:* gives forth a Testimony under his hand, dated *London* 29*th.* 3*d. Month* 1673, denying he ever spoke such words, or any thing like them, calling it an abominable lie, & wicked slander,

and

and appeals to GOD to clear his Innocency: But after some search, *Nicholas* is sent to one *Henry Stout* to prove the matter, who at last gave his Testimony in write under his hand, thus,

"I *Henry Stout* of *Hartford*, never in all my "dayes heard *Nicholas Lucas* speak the words "(nor any of the like importance or tendencie as) charged on him, by *Tho. Hicks* "nor before any man else that I can call to "mind. But am satisfied in my conscience, "that he hath most grosly wronged *N. L.* "To which I subscribe. *Hen. Stout.*

So now let the *Reader* judge what seared Consciences, and Brazen faces these men have, or our *Patroclus* to cite such a base and false calumny.

The second Citation, is that of *William Penns* Rejoynder, *Page* 70, 73. We have good reason to deny them to be the rule of Faith and Judge of controversy, which can neither give nor govern Faith, nor Judge of Controversies. If he added the rest, I should have left it to the *Reader* to Judge without more. And therefore I shall only add these following words as they lye;

bas *Viz:*

viz. As the many different perſwaſions "in the World fully prove: For then "all that have the Scriptures would be of "one perſwaſion, as it is moſt certain "thoſe are who have, & walk by the one Spirit. Let the Word be joyned and then Judge. The other part of his Citation is *Page* 73, thus in ſhort, the *Scriptures* are not the Rule, but a declaration of Faith and knowledge, Here he ſtops: But I intreat the *Reader* before he truſt theſe men to be at the pains to read the Book Cited by him: There he ſhall ſee whither *William Penn* and his friends deſerves to be called diſparragers of the *Scriptures*, and that it looks more like malice and intereſt that acts theſe men than the love of Truth. The reſt of his Citations, at leaſt many of them, I never ſaw nor read, but in ſuch books as his.

Page 9. About the end, he falls upon a long Citation of *William Penn's* rejoynder, concerning the Canon; The Authority of thoſe who gathered it, the Tranſcribers and their diſſentions, the exactneſs of the coppies, And laſtly that ſome learned men of our times tell us of little leſs then 3000 ſeveral readings in the *Scriptures of the New Teſtament* in *Greek*. *Anſwer*, Can he

he say *William Penn* hath lied in what he hath Written? If he do, I will produce him *Protestant* Authors who confess no less. But if he had added the rest of *William Penns* words he had done more honestly, but not so much to his purpose, and therefore I will do him the kindness to set down a few of them.

"Farr be it from me (saith *William Penn*) to Write this in any the least undervalue of that Holy Record. It's only to shew the weak foundation my Adversaries foundation stands upon. I believe great and Good Things of them, and that from no less evidence then the *Eternal Word* that gave them forth; Which hath often times given my Soul a deep Savour of these blessed Truths it declares of, &c. And after many such expressions he concludes "We accept them "as the Words of GOD Himself, And "by the assistance of his Spirit, they are "read with great Instruction and Comfort, I esteem them the best of Writings, and desire nothing more frequently then that I may lead the Life they "exhort to.

Thus *William Penn*, Whereby the Reader may perceive the malice and disingenuity

of

of *Patroclus* in concealling the Words which would have vindicated him from that foul charge of vilifying the Scriptures. And I desire the Reader will only compare *Patroclus* and his Party with the *Pharasees*, who while they extolled the Scriptures were found the murderers and persecuters of CHRIST and his Apostles.

Having thus dissingenuously dealt with *William Penn*, he falls upon R. B. in these words: On the other hand of this *Ethnick* Army, R. B. Assaulteth the intrinsick Arguments and Divine Characters imprinted on the Scriptures, Citing his Apologie, *Chap:* 2. That they do not think that the Authority of the Scriptures doth depend on any Efficacy or Virtue in these Writings, *&c:* And so runs on for a whole page in tragical Exclamations.

To all which I shall only return the words of *Calvine*, *instit. cap.* 1. *Numb:* 24. " *Quare, si Conscientiis optime consultum vo-*
" *lumus, ne instabili dubitatione perpetuo va-*
" *cillent altius petenda, quam ab humanis, vel*
" *rationibus, vel judiciis, vel conjecturis scrip-*
" *turæ Authoritas: Nempe ab Interiori spiritus*
" *sancti Testificatione: Etsi enim Reverentiam*
" *sua sibi ultro Majestate conciliat, tunc tamen*
" *demum serio nos afficit cum per Spiritum obsig-*

" *nata eſt cordibus noſtris.* And a little after, " *Talis ergo eſt perſuaſio quæ rationes non requi-* " *rat talis denique ſenſus qui niſi ex cæleſti Re-* " *velatione naſci nequeat. Non aliud loquor* " *quam quod apud ſe experitur fidelium unuſ-* " *quiſque.* Thus *Calvine.* In Engliſh thus, *Wherefore, if we would take the beſt courſe to provide for the peace or clearneſs of our own Con-ſciences, that they may not perpetually fluctuate with an unſtable uncertaintie, the Authoritie of the Scripture is to be deduced higher, then either from Humane Reaſons, Judgements, or Con-jectures:* viz. *From the* Inward-witneſ-bearing *of the Holy Spirit: For albeit its own Native Majeſtie doth gain to it a peculiar Reve-rence, yet then doth it ſeriouſly affect us, when it is ſealed upon our hearts.* And a little after, *Such then is that Perſwaſion which requires not Reaſons, and ſuch; that Perception which cannot be bred but of a Revelation from Heaven. I do not ſpeak any other thing, then what every one of the Faithful finds experimentally true in himſelf.*

And now let the Reader judge whether *R: B:* hath ſaid any more then *Calvine* hath ſaid: *That every one of the Faithful experienceth in himſelf;* Yet what is ſound Doctrine in *Calvine* muſt be *Heathniſm* in *R: B:*

And whereas he ſaith, ſhall the writings of

of *Livie*, *Virgil*, and *Cicero* carry ſuch evi-
dences that they were theirs, ſo that a
Humaniſt may diſtinguiſh, *&c.* Shall
then GOD Himſelf be outſtriped and o-
vercome by theſe Writers?

Anſwer, Albeit we neither deny the Majeſty of Stile, Harmony of parts, or any other Divine Characters in the *ſcriptures*, which may declare their Author: Yet we confidently affirm that the foreſaid writings of *Livie*, *Virgil*, and *Cicero*, which are the things of a man can only be known by the ſpirit of a man, and not of a beaſt; So we ſay, the *ſcriptures* being the *things of GOD* can only and alone be known by *the Spirit of GOD*, as ſaith the Apoſtle in ſo many words.

But he proceeds, and citeth the word, (as he alledgeth) of *Benjamin Furley*, and for his Author gives *Hicks* the Forger; And then he falls a glorying as if he had done his buſineſs fully, ſaying, by this time I have aboundantly juſtified my charge. Soft *Patroclus*, till thou put off thine Armour. *An:* I cannot but wonder with what confidence, or rather impudence this man and his brother *Brown* can cite theſe books of *Faldo*, *Hicks*, *&c.* Which have been ſo fully & manifeſtly convicted

ed of falſehood, forgery, and perverſion, that their Authors are become deteſteable to all honeſt and unbyaſſed men, and whom our preſent adverſary accounteth *Hereticks*: And what a caſe muſt the *Quakers* be in, if ſuch *Janizaries* in Religion, who have been known to undertake the contraverſy for hire, and have been found to be men of no integrity; I ſay, if ſuch men their ſworn Enemies ſhall be held ſufficient witneſſes againſt them? If *I* ſhould produce the *Papiſts* Teſtimonies againſt *Luther* aud *Beza*, what would *Proteſtants* ſay? And albeit *R. B.* chargeth *Brown* with it as a callumniator, yet our Author hath not brought the leaſt proof to mend the matter, nor the Citation of any book but his beloved Baptiſt Mr. *Hicks* (as he calls him.) And whereas he ſaith they have Cited book and page for their other Citations, ſo did *Patroclus* cite *William Penns Rejoynder*, when he accuſed him for ſaying the Books of *Matthew*, *Mark*, *Luke*, *and John* did not contain glade tidings, ſo the Proverb is veryfied in all of them. *A Prieſt, a Liar, no news*; And ſo till he prove theſe to have been the words of *Benjamine Furley* I have done with him.

And here I muſt tell *Patroclus* I have ſeen

ſeen *Browns* book which was lent by an old and learned Miniſter, ſo called of the National Church, with the *Caveat*. "I "would not, *ſaid he*, lend you this Book, but "that I know ye would get it from ſome "other: For if all the coppies were in my "hands, they ſhould never be more ſeen. "I acknowledge they are a ſcandle to our "Profeſſion, and the Anthor a ſtain to his "function; But, (*ſaid he*,) do not think we "allow them. And the truth is, except *Pol-*"*wart* and *Montgomeries* flyting, I never "read its fellow.

But to return to what *R: B:* anſwereth in the matter of *Benjamin Furley*, he hath ſet it down at large, and ſpends a deal of labour upon it. He begins with *R: B:* his delemma, to which he anſwereth: Seeing *R: B:* inſinuateth, that there are an ſubjective Revelations and, elſewhere clearly denyeth that there are any, therefore his dilemma is impertinent, *&c.* Now let the Reader judge what cander we can expect from this man who hath out done both *Hicks* and *Faldo*, they cited book and page, yet were found Forgers; He cites nothing, yet would be truſted, let him mend this fault with the next before he produce his *argumentum ad hominem*, and

his

his absurd and malicious consequence upon it: Which is, that according to the *Quakers*, men are not oblidged to abstain from Murther, without such an immediate objective Revelation as *Moses* and the Prophets had.

Answer, This is very dissingenuous, did ever any *Quakers* pretend to give a new Law to the World, and confirm it by miracles, as did *Moses*? Or did they ever teach, That the Foretelling of things to come (as did the Prophets) was necessary to Salvation? The *Quakers* pretend to no new Revelations of new things, but to a new Revelation of the good old things, as shall be seen more hereafter; And for such stuff it may take with *Patroclus* Hearers, but every Man of Sense will detease such dealing.

His second Answer to this *Dilemma*, is yet no better; For saith he, *Tho the Illumination of the Spirit be of absolute necessity, for such a knowledge of the Scriptures whereby we may know GOD revealed in them, and have true Love and Faith, and Fear*, &c. *Yet he that shall deny that any Reader of the Scriptures, tho endued with sound reason only, can distinguish betwixt Commands given to a particular people for a certain time; and these that bind at all times*

times; must have abandoned the exercise of Reason. This the Summ of what he saith.

Answer first, What he meaneth by the Word (*Only*) I see not, Except he think Reason can do something more, But what this is he hath not been so honest as to tell us: He hath said before, that the *Illumination of the Spirit is absolutly necessary to such a knowledge of the Scriptures, as is usefull to beget Faith, Love, and Fear of* GOD. *&c.* But he would teach us another Knowledge which *reason* cannot *produce.* But if he will allow me the first, I shal allow him the last to get his Living by. Only I must tell the Reader, that in this he outdoes the *Socinian* who in his Catechism aforesaid. *Cap* 3. *quest*: 3. Laid the blame of the Differences about the *sense of the Scriptures* on their not imploring the Gift *of the Holy Spirit* which GOD hath promised to those that call upon Him. And lastly, I wonder to see a pretended *Presbyterian* cite the Examples of the third and fifth Commandements. Of which two precepts they have been such notorious Transgressors.

His third Answer is as unhappy as the rest, For he laboureth to cause R. B. to contradict B. F. While he hath neither cleared his Brethren *Hicks* and *Brown* from being reputed Calumniators: Nor hath attempted

attempted any way to prove these to have been the Words of B. F. But thinks the World is bound to believe him, because he saith it, Where I leave him to rave till he bring better proof.

He tells us Fourthly, That it is impertinent to say that without the Operation *of the Spirit*, men cannot obey the Good of their *own Souls*, And is saith he, *falcem pro ligone dare*. Answer, It seems the Man intends an Obedience which is *not for the good of Mens own Souls*; And what this can be, except it be either *superstition* or *supererogation* I am to learn. As for his Proverb; I fear if the Men of his Robe did not get the Sickle before the Spade, That is did not eat the Fruit before they planted a Vineyard, we should see many of them with *Lean cheeeks*, and *Lank sides*. But as he hath told us before of two kinds of Knowledge, one from the *Spirit*, another from *Reason*. So he tells here of two kinds of Duties, one *profitable* for the Soul, but the other he hath not told us for what, and such are many of his Duties like to be.

In the fifth place he chargeth B.F. with Blasphemie, for saying that it is (as he alledgeth) the greatest Error in the World that ever was invented, and the ground of all

all errour to affirm, that the *Scriptures ought to be a Rule to Christians*: And then he tells us the palpableness of the Blasphemy is an Antidote to the poison; and hath rendred R. B. speechless.

Well *Patroclus*! And is this all the proof that yet we have against B. F. Now three times printed without proof; And R. B. might have justly rejected it at first, and herewith falls what thou brings in the last place, which was a sufficient answer to I: B: and is yet to thee till thou clear him of these ignominious Epithets of Fool and Calumniator (as thou calls them) which neither thou nor he have ever yet attempted.

But *I* must ask thee a little, What thou intends here by blasphemy? For whatever the old signification of the Word may have been; *I* am sure a Blasphemer is now taken for a Man, who by injurious word or thought hurteth the *Divine Majesty*; So that except the Scripture be *Patroclus* God, he cannot find Blasphemy in the forelaid Words.

Lastly, All the Proof we have is, *If*, says he, *the words were falsified*, he was bound to have vindicated and delivered them. Here we have a new Law; if any Man call *Patroclus* a *Thief*, he is bound to prove himself

himself an *honest Man*; And hence it shall follow that no *Lyar* can be punished.

To conclude this particular, Notwithstanding this Author accuseth the *Quakers* as Velifiers of the Scriptures. Yet *GOD is our Witness*, that it is far from our Intention, but on the contrary we have a *high and reverent esteem of them*, And altho some years agoe this Language might have passed for good Coyn; Yet now (Blessed be the LORD) we are better known both by our Principles and practices, not only to our Neighbours, but to many knowing Men all *Brittan* over, then we formerly were, So that a *malicious Priest*, will not be so readily trusted, being a *kind of men who cannot sleep unless they have wounded some*, either in their persons or Reputations. I shal here only desire the Reader to see *Duplessis* of the Trueness of *Christian Religion*, cap: 6. Where he shall see, That before the Canon of the Scriptures were filled up, yea before many of them were written, CHRIST is called the *Word of GOD*, not only by the *Jews*, but by the *Heathen Philosophers* and their *Oracles*; So that there was a *Word of GOD* before the Scriptures.

And secondly, If the *Preaching of the Gospel be glad Tidings*, Then the Preaching of *Patroclus* is not the Preaching of the Gospel, According to *Luke* 2. 10. *Behold I bring*

you

you good Tidings of great joy, which ſhall be to all people; Whereas his Doctrine of Reprobation, is the moſt ſad and lamentable Tydings that ever was preached to Mankind. For firſt by their Confeſſion of Faith, cap. 3. A certain number are elected from Eternity and the means foreordained to bring them to Glory, and all the reſt of Mankind are ordained to diſhonour and wrath, Now the means whereby this end is attained and fore ordained for that purpoſe, are (according to their Catechiſm) The *Word Sacraments* and *Prayer*. And ſo according to *Patrocl.* *All Mankind who want theſe means are reprobates*, conſider then *Reader*, into how narrow a Compaſs he brings *all people*: The World *being divided into* 30 *parts*, There be yet 19 of them *Pagan*, and ſix *Mahumitan*, and only *five Chriſtian*; The half of this five is of the *Romiſh Communion*, & want the uſe of the *Bible!* The *Lutherans*, he ſaieth, in his Epiſtle to the *Reader*, *deſerve not the Name of Reformed, but are to be accounted Capital Adverſaries*; The Church of *England* is infected with the *Hemlock of Pelagianizm*, and *Epiſcopacy* is an *Antichriſtian Hierarchy*; The *French Proteſtants* are for *paſſive obedience*, and *Non Reſiſtance*; And even *Geneva* it ſelf errs in two great points,

Viz:

Viz. In allowing *Lawful Recreations on the Sabbath day*, and denying *Tithes* to the *Clergie*: And our *English Presbyterians* are such enemies to the *Scottish Covenant*, that they have gone near to Anathematize it: For *R. Baxter* in his hundreth propositions, wherein he layeth all *Protestants* are aggreed; Propos. 99 saith, *If any will make their unnecessary forms of Synods, and other adjuncts to seem so necessary, as to enter Leagues and Covenants, to make them the terms of the Churches Unity; GOD will not owne such terms nor waves, nor will they be durable*, &c. With much more to this purpose. And now let the Reader judge whither *Patroclus* Gospel be glad tidings to all people.

We are now come to the *Rule of Faith, and Life, page* 17, where having begun with a great lie, *Viz. That in the judgement of the Quakers the Scriptures are in no sense to be accounted a Rule.*) He citeth *VVilliam* Penn, to prove it, *Rejoynder page* 76. I beseech thee Reader here to take notice of this mans double dealing, and dissingenuity: For first *VVilliam Penn* in *page* 69 and 70, confesseth the Scriptures to be a Rule, but not the Rule, by way of excellency, as the Reader may see there, and in *R. Barclays*, his appologie *Theses Tertia.*

And

And becauſe he Citeth *VVilliam* Penn to prove his falſe aſſertion, let the Reader know they are no words of *VVilliam* Penn, but of one *Thomas Collier*, a great Profeſſor, whoſe words *VVilliam* Penn Citeth againſt *Faldo*, ſome whereof I ſhall tranſcribe, General Epiſtle, *page* 249.

And truely, my Brethren, it is my earneſt deſire to ſee ſouls to live more in the Spirit, and leſs in the Letter, then they will ſee that we judge of the *Letter* by the *Spirit*, and not of the *Spirit* by the *Letter*: Which occaſions ſo much ignorance amongſt us, and theſe who profeſs themſelves to be our Teachers, are chief in this Treſpaſs. *The Spirit of GOD* who is GOD, is the *alone Rule* of a *Spiritual Chriſtian*, and in *page* 48, he ſaith, That ſome ſeting the *ſcriptures* in the Room of the *ſpirit*, they make them an Idol.

His next Citation of *VVilliam* Penn in *page* 18, is his Rejoynder, *page* 71, where he Citeth theſe words, the *ſcriptures* are the *verbal* and *Hiſtorical Rule* of Faith, which is the devels faith. *William* Penns words are theſe: For Faith in his (I: *Faldo*) ſenſe riſes no higher then ſo many articles laid down (ſuppoſe truely according to the letter of the *ſcriptures* which the *devil* can

believ

belive as well as he: This Faith I call meerly verbal and Hiſtorical, &c. And this is the candour of our inſulting adverſary; Let the Reader judge whoſe reputation can be ſafe who deals with ſuch an impudent Calumniator.

In the ſame page, and in contradiction to himſelf, he mentions a diſtinction of *primary*, and *Secondary*. Well *Patroclus*, it ſeems the *Quakers own the ſcriptures* in ſome ſenſe to be a Rule, therefore *Patroclus* confeſſeth himſelf to have belyed them in the foregoing page.

His third, is *Huberthorn*, The words are, except by a *Miraculous Revelation from Heaven*, Theſe words ſound harſhly, and ſo fit to defame the *Quakers*; But (if yet thou haſt retained any ſhamefacedneſs, or the leaſt grain of honeſty) I charge thee tell me: Have not *George Keith* in his Books on that ſubject, and *Robert Barclay* in his Appollogie ſufficiently cleared the *Quakers* in that point: So far, that if thou wilt rightly ſtate the contraverſie, thou muſt lay aſide all theſe expreſſions of miraculous extraordinary, and the like; But who can expect fare dealing from a man of thy manners?

And therefore to ſtop the mouth of this

this Callumniator, I ſhall tell the Reader what *George Kieth* ſayes to obviat ſuch accuſations, immediate Revel: *page* 2. *Firſt, we do not underſtand the foretelling things to come*, &c. Secondly, (*page* 3) *We do not hereby underſtand the Revelation of an other Goſpel*, &c. Thirdly (in page 7.) *Nor an outward audible voice*, &c. Fourthly, *Nor any outward audible voice.* Fifthly, *Nor dreams and viſions*, &c. Sixthly, Nor any *outward Miracles*, &c. And now let the Reader judge with what candour this man hath repreſented us.

Page 18 and 19. He ſaith in order to the production of *true ſaving Faith*, two principles are required; Firſt the *declaration* of the *object*, or thing to be believed, &c. Now the thing he would have me believe, is, that the *ſcripture* is the *Rule of Faith* and *Life*, and in order to this he preſents me the *Bible*; If I ask him, how ſhall I believe this book to be the *Rule of Faith and Life?* He anſwereth me, *the book ſaith ſo* (tho there be no ſuch word in it) And this is *objective Revelation*, and needs no more but an *application* of this *Revelation* already made. And the ſecond he calls *ſubjective revelation*, but he muſt excuſe me to tell him, that before he can perſwaed

me

perſwad me to believe that propoſition laid down in the *Weſtminſter Confeſſion* or *Catechiſm: Queſt:* 2, that the *ſcripture is the only rule.*) He will need to produce me better arguments for the *Holy Ghoſt* (according to the *Weſtminſter Confeſſion*, Chap 7, Act 3) muſt be given to make men willing and able to believe, and this is more then an application.

He tells us that this *revelation* was either *mediate* or *immediate.* Who denyes this? But I hope when it was *mediate*, it needed the *immediate operation* of the *ſpirit* to make them able and willing to believe, and ſo the operation of the Spirit was the Rule of this Faith whereby they chooſed or rejected theſe mediate *Revelations.*

That the *illumination of the ſpirit* is neceſſary for underſtanding of the *ſcriptures*, no man denyeth; But it is to be regrated that he and his Brethren take upon them to expond *ſcripture* to others, while they have it not, and mock and perſecute others who bear witneſs for it.

To prove ſubjective Revelation, he bringeth ſeveral Scriptures; Among others *Luke* 24. 46. The Words are theſe, *And ſaid unto them, Thus it is Written, and thus it behooved Chriſt to ſuffer, and to riſe*

riſe from the dead the third day. Now the Queſtion will be, whether this was an objective, or a ſubjective *Revelation*; I affirm it to be *Objective*, and that CHRIST did here reveal to them things they never knew before, nor had occaſion to know, albeit they might have been darkly ſhadowed forth in the Scriptures; So that Chriſt ſpeaking to them, and at the ſame time opening their Underſtandings, both *Patroclus* principles concurred immediatly to the production of their Faith with out the Bible: Neither is he limited to Scripture words, tho he may and often does make uſe of them; And theſe words He ſpoke are not to be found in all the *Old Teſtament*. And the *Quakers* do not pretend to revelation of *New Things*, but a new Revelation of the *Good Old Things*.

Secondly, Conſider that he calls his firſt Principle a *Declaration of the Object* or *Thing to be believed*. Now the Scriptures are the *Object* or *Thing to be believed*; And therefore (according to himſelf) the *Declaration* is neceſſary. And I muſt ask *Patroclus* what this Declaration is? Sure he can intend nothing here but the Gloſſes, Commentaries, Paraphraſes, which he and his Brethren make upon the Scriptures,

whereby they get their Living. But if Men were but once convinced that Christs sheep hear his Voice, and that his Spirit teacheth them, and bringeth all things to their remembrance whatsoever they have heard of (or from) him; Then that sordid Trade of Preaching for hyre, and Divining for money, would soon come to an end; And Men would say with *Thomas a Kempis*; *Let not Moses and the Prophets speake to me, but thou, O LORD my GOD.* And with the Psalmist, *I will hear what the LORD GOD will speake in me.* Whereas now (pretend what they will) they are as positive in their dogmatising and no less angry to be contradicted then their Ancestors the *Papists*. Hence it is evident, that it is their Interpretations, sense and Preachments upon the Scriptures, which they would have to be the *Rule of Faith*, and the *Declaration of the Object*.

In page 20 He makes a digression, wherein he tels us the same things overagain; therefore I shal only touch such things, as chiefly concern the matter in hand, if it be yet lawful for a *Plowman* to touch his schoolterms, by which that *Trib* have darkned Counsell with words without Knowledge: And if *Patroclus* be a *Parochus*, or Parish-Priest, I am sure the tenth man of his Hearers cannot understand his Terms.

First

First, He confounds the Material with the *formal Object*, saying as the Scriptures hold forth other Truths, so they evidently declare and manifest the Characters of their Divinity; Even as the Sun proveth himself to be the Sun by his own Irradiant and illustrious Beams: And this in contradiction, both to *Calvine* and himself. To *Calvine* in the place before cited; Where he saith, That to settle the Conscience, such a Perswasion is necessary as needeth no Reasons; And such a sense as cannot be attained but by *Divine Revelation*. To himself in page 23. Where he saith, We being demanded, how we know the Scriptures to be the Word of GOD? We answer by the Testimony and operation of the Spirit. And herein he may reconcile himself to himself and his friends when he hath Leasure.

Secondly, In page 22. speaking of *subjective Revelation*, he calls the spirit an Instrument in the hand of GOD: This Language sounds not sweetly to me, for I believe the Spirit is GOD, and therefore cannot like these Words; GOD an Instrument in the Hand of GOD.

3ly. He tells us in page 23 That *subjective revelation* is more properly called an Appli-

cation then Revelation it self. And yet in the same page he calls it the Testimony and Operation of the Spirit; Now a Testimony is a Witness bearing; And we know a dumb Man cannot be a Witness; But he hath told us, That the Spirit speaks neither to the Ear nor the Mind, and so cannot bear a Testimony: This is palpable confusion.

Fourthly, page 24. He saith, so that we can Reason, because such a Spirit (*v. g.*) He that confesseth Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is said by the Scriptures to be of GOD; Therefore I know and believe that is true Doctrine, and that this Spirit is of GOD. If this Scripture be taken Literally by *Petrobelus*, and that he intends as he Writes, I must confess I expected not so much Charity at his hands; For at this rate he accepteth *Papists*, *Lutherians*, yea and the *Pelagian Church* of *England*, who all believe that Christ is come in the flesh; But I will expect a Commentary upon the Words with the next.

Fifthly, In the same page he saith, We do not with the *Fanatical Enthusiasts* reason thus; The Spirit bids me believe that such and such Books are the Scriptures; Therefore I believe them to be so: But he hath given

given us no Reason, why he believes such and such Books to be the Scriptures; For which we must wait his Leasure.

Sixthly, His lame example of the Sun and Ey-salve is no better; He saith by means of the Salve he seeth and knoweth the Sun; And again by the Suns Light he may perceive what is Ey-salve, and what is not: But he might have considered, That tho he see the Sun and Ey-salve both, he needeth his Natural Understanding to know the Sun, and to discern what is Ey-salve and what is not; And as in Naturals, so in Spirituals. *No man knoweth the things of a man, but the spirit of a man which is in him, so the things of GOD no man knoweth, but by the spirit of God.*

Seventhly, In page 26. He chargeth R. B. for calling the *Westminster Divines* dark, &c. Because they did not separate the Word from the Spirit; But said that the Testimony of the Spirit was in and with the Word; And then reflects upon R. B's. Vindication, page 33. But takes no notice of what he saith page 32. and 34. Because they were too hot for his fingers. He citeth *Isaiah* 59. 21. *My spirit which is in thee, and my Words which I have put in thy mouth*, &c. Observe *First*, That the Te-

nor

nor of this Covenant is Spiritual; *My Spirit which is in thee.* *Secondly*, That they are distinct tho not contrary, else they needed not the copulative Conjunction: (And) *Thirdly*, They are called *Words* and not *Word*. So then *Patroclus* confesseth, That GOD putteth Words in his mouth to preach to his People, I shall allow him to be concerned in this Covenant. And I hope he will not hereafter be angry with the Quakers for calling the Scriptures the *Words of GOD*.

Eighthly, He saith there was never the least controversy betwixt the *British* and *Transmarine* Divines on this head, but an intire Harmony. *This is another Lie*, I shall instance one *Jo. Wolf. Baier*, Professor of Divinity at *Jena* in *Germany*, writting on that Subject against the Quakers, page 32 and 34. Saith the inward Illuminations and Operations of the Spirit are altogether necessary to beget true and saving Faith in Men, and that these inward Illuminations are objective, or by way of Object; Which is not very Harmonious with *Patroclus* Doctrine of Application. And this is all the discovery he hath made of R. B's Non such weakness and extream disingenuity, which he hath left undiscovered till his next Printing.

And

And now in page 26. He ſaith, he comes directly to the Objection. Saying *Firſt*, The Work of the Spirit, the neceſſity of which we maintain is only ſubjective, being rather if we ſpeak properly, an Application of the things revealed in Scripture, then a Revelation or Teſtimony ſtrictly ſo taken. Obſerve *Firſt*, That this being granted, all theſe words of *Proteſtant Writers*, ſuch as the Teſtimony, Illumination, Inſpiration, Perſwaſion of the Spirit, are but meer cheats and impoſtures put upon Mankind; And that *Calvine* when he ſpeaketh of *Divine Revelation* as neceſſary to beget *True Faith*, meant no ſuch thing, nor any of theſe Authors he citeth, are to be underſtood according to their own words, but according to *Patroclus* ſenſe, and thus he and his Brethren deal by the Scriptures. *He adds*, Whereas the Revelations to which the Quakers pretend are altogether objective, like that of the Prophets. *This is another Lie*, for the Quakers own both Subjective and Objective Revelations, as hath been ſhowen above. I ſhall here add *Luk.* 24. 32. *Did not our Hearts burn within us, while he talked with us by the way, and while he opened to us the Scriptures.* Now let the Reader judge

judge whether this was an Objective Revelation as well as Subjective; *Their hearts burnt*, and *he opened to them the Scriptures*: Now *Opening* presupposeth a *Shutting*, and the Lamb only is found worthy to open the Seals of the Book; *That is*, To reveal the Object.

In page 27. He saith, we assert the sufficiency of the Scriptures as a Rule containing all things necessary to be believed or done, which they deny. *This is another Lie*, For the Quakers believe the *Scriptures* to be a Rule subordinat to the Spirit, containing a full and sufficient Declaration of all Christian Doctrine.

Thirdly, saith he, We believe the Scriptures to be the principal and ultimat Rule, into which our Faith is lastly to be resolved. For answer to this, I shall only set down the words of one of his Brethren, *Viz*: The Author of that Book called *Melius Inquirendum*, page 303. *I would fain be informed* (sayes he) *what an ultimat Rule signifies, with him that pretends to speak plain* English, *to them that understand nothing else: I have heard of a subordinate and ultimat End; And I have heard also of a near and a remote Rule, but an ultimate Rule like that Monster which was like a Horse, and yet not a*

Horse

Horſe, it like Senſe, but in Truth very None-ſenſe. Thus he, and yet as great a *Calviniſt* as *Patroclus.*

After ſome Repetitions he comes to his Citations, and begins with *Luther* in theſe Words; If any thing ſhould deliver any *Doctrine which it could not prove by Scripture he would ſpit in its face, knowing certainly that it were the Devil.* I know no *Quaker* but will ſay as much; Yea, I know no *Proteſtant* but will ſay as much: Yet the controverſies are no whit leſſened by all this, becauſe they reject the Spirit by which alone the Scriptures can be underſtood, and without which they are a ſealed book as well to the learned *Patroclus* as to the unlearned *Plowgh man.* And here let the Reader obſerve what is become the fate of the Fathers as well as of the Scriptures, To be cited By all parties, *Papiſt* againſt *Papiſts*, and *Proteſtant* againſt *Proteſtants*, and *Calvine* is made to ſpeak for all ends and all purpoſes: But he hath told us, that ſuch a perſwaſion concerning *the authority of Scripture* is needfull, as cannot be brought forth but by *Divine Revelation. Inſt: Chap: Numb:* 24.

All theſe his citations for three pages ſerve for nothing elſe but to make one par-

ty

ty of his pretended *Tranſmarine* Divines, contradict another. If he had done any thing, he ſhould have proven *R: B*'s. citations to have been either ſpurious or impertinent, elſe if they contradict his citations, *Patroclus* errs in his affirming an *Harmony* among them. In page 31, he ſaith (after ſome of his Brethrens Rhetorick) it can be made out by the unanimous conſent of all the reformed Churches: But hath taken no notice of what *R: B:* hath cited out of their Confeſſions, but we muſt take his word.

In the end of page 31, and the beginning of page 32, he ſummeth up what he hath ſaid, and hath done the *Quakers* a favour, that whereas ſome of his blind brethren have called them *Papiſts*, he hath ſet them and the *Papiſts* at ſuch a diſtance, as he hath left room for himſelf to hang betwixt them, as *Eraſmus* is ſaid *to have hung betwixt Heaven and hell*: For ſaith he, page 32 The *Papiſts have gone too low, reſolving their faith ultimatly in men*; The *Quakers* on the other hand *attempting to go too high* (that is) *to reſolve their Faith in GOD*; *Patroclus* reſolves his faith in a Book, and neither in GOD nor man; Let the *Reader* judge which of the three is the beſt Foundation.

He

He concludes with a *Greek* fable of *Ixion* (*Et quiquid Græcia mendax audet in Historia*) & most profainly compares a desire after *Divine Revelation* (which *Pauls* commands to pray for) to the adulterous desire of *Ixion* after *Juno*, and then talks of the production of *Hipocentaurs*, that is in broad *Scots Troopers*, or if he will, Apostolical *Dragoons*, Like those of *France*. And now let the Kingdom of *Scotland* judge from *fourty years experience*, whether the *Quakers* or the *Presbyterian* Clergie have been most fruitful in producing such *Hipocentaurs*.

In page 32, he layeth down his *Thesis* thus: *The scriptures are the adequat, compleat and primary or prineipal Rule of faith and manners.* Observe first, the word *primary* signifies first, and he hath before called them the *Ultimate Rule*: This is the first and the last, he hath called them *The word of GOD*, he hath called them the *Gospel*, and now the first and the last, which are *Epithets* belonging only to Christ: *Tertul: lib: 2 Carm: Adversurs* Mar:

Atque ideo non verba Libri sed Missus in orbem,
Ipse Christus Evangelium est, Si cernere vultis.

Thus Englished.

Not the words of the book, but Christ who is into the World sent, the Gospell is.

Ob.

Obſerve Secondly, That he hath here given away the Cauſe, for the Catechiſm ſaith, *The Scriptures are the only Rule*, Whereas his aſſerting a *Primary* implyes a *Secondary*.

And now we are come to his Arguments, whereof the firſt is; That which was dictat or given out by the *Infallible God*, and containeth the whole *Counſell of GOD*, may well ſerve to be a compleat and principal Rule; But the Scriptures were given out and dictate by the *Infallible GOD*, and contain the whole *Counſell of GOD*. Therefore, They may well ſerve for to be a compleat and principal Rule.

Anſwer firſt, Obſerve, That all his boaſting is come to no more then a *May be*, ſaying, *It may ſerve to be a Primary Rule*: And I muſt tell him, That a Cart-load of *May-bees*, are not worth *One-is*.

Secondly, I muſt tell him, That his definition of the *Rule* of *Faith* and *Manners* is *New*, and I cannot accept of it. And before I proceed to take nottice of his Arguments, I ſhall give my Reader an account of the Scope of this Mans Labours. *Firſt*, He

He cannot deny that the *Quakers* owne the Scriptures for a Rule, and his Work proves no leſs (tho in contradiction to himſelf in page 17.) And I can aſſure my Reader, That it is the conſtant care of every true *Quaker* to *ſquare his Life according to the Scriptures*. *Secondly*, His offering to prove them to be a *Primary Rule* implyes (as I have ſaid) a *Secondary*: And this muſt be the *Teachings of the Spirit*, for he hath not told us of another: Hence the Reader may ſee, what the Tendancy of his Argumentations is, *To wit*, To exalt the Letter above the Spirit; The Creature above the Creator, a Book above GOD; In which I cannot agree with him; Yet GOD knows I reverence the Scriptures as much as any *Presbyterian* in the World: And if the *Quakers* ſlighted them (as this falſe Accuſer ſlandereth them) I would have no fellowſhip with them. And certainly it is not ſo much the Scriptures, as their own Gloſſes and Interpretations they plead for: For if *Patroclus* would ſpeak what he thinks, I doubt not but he would ſay, That the *Weſtminſter Confeſſion* and *Directory*; Eſpecially having the *Covenant* joyned to it, might ſerve for a Rule of Faith and Life.

His

His Argument ſet down before erreth in the very form, according to the Rules of *Logick*; Which are when both Propoſitions are particular, nothing follows. And again the *Major* being particular in the firſt figure cannot rightly conclude. Now that his *Major* is particular will be evident, if he explain himſelf what he means by the word (*That*) By which he cannot underſtand Man nor beaſt, nor Angel nor any other thing, if he ſpeake ſenſe but *that Book*: And ſo his Argument will run thus, *That particular Book which was dictate*, &c: But the Book called the BIBLE or the Scripture was dictate, *&c*: Therefore, *&c*: If he thinks I have wronged him, let him explain himſelf next, and make his *Major* univerſal.

Secondly, This is a direct begging of the Queſtion, for it is denyed that a Book can be the *Primary Rule of Faith*, for there was *Faith* before there was a *Book* in the World, and the World was two thouſand years without Scriptures, and if they had no Rule nor Law to walk by, then they had no ſin; *For where there is no Law there is no tranſgreſſion*: If they had a Rule, it was certainly *Prior* to the Scriptures, and conſequently the *Primary* Rule, except that

Patroclus

Patroclus would ſay, *That GOD had changed his Rule* !

His *Minor* is a very uncontraverted Truth in the firſt part of it; But he muſt excuſe me to diſtinguiſh the ſecond; *And contains the whole Counſel of GOD:* Which I think *Robert Barkelay* hath done to very good Purpoſe; That the *Scriptures* containe a full account of all the *Eſſentials* and *fundamental* Doctrines of the *Chriſtian Religion*: But that many things occurr dayly of which the Scriptures do not clearly determine our Experience clearly proveth: And firſt as to *Faith*, I deſire he may give me plain Scripture for *Perſons* in the *Godhead*? *Sacraments* in the *Church*, and keeping *Holy Sunday*. This was required by K: *CHARLES* the *Martyr*, from *Alexander Henderſon*; But how it was *Anſwered*, the Papers which paſt betwixt them will evince.

Secondly. As to *Life*, I ask whether it was lawfull for me in my Youth to take the *League* and *Covenant*? Being firſt contrary to the Command of Chriſt, *Swear not at all*; And then contrary to the command of the Supreem Magiſtrate; Yea, in oppoſition to Him, whome the *Scripture* commands me to obey. This was a

Caſe

Case of Conscience to me, and yet by the *Presbyterian Church* I was commanded (*his non obstantibus*) to take it; And by *George Gillespie* in his *Cases of Conscience*, the refusing of the *Covenant* is called sinful in it self, a great dishonour to GOD, and *a great scandal to the Church, no less punishable then the killing of the Apostles.* Nevertheless, *I must say, I can find no Scripture which allows me to take it.* And again there is a great doubt at present seeming to arise in the minds of many *Protestants* and Well-wishers to the Government; Which is, whether the *Popish Monarchical tyrranie* in *Church Government*, or *Presbyterian Democratical tyrranie* be more *eligible*? for it is now become a *common Litanie*; from *Popery* and *Presbytrie*, *libera nos*, &c. As for that great and incureable Schism, which destroyed *Presbytrie* in the Assembly at *Dundee*; Whether a *Malignant* having in the Nation an Estate, Wife, and Children, might lawfully fight in defence of his Native Country; In Case of a forraign Invasion.

These and such like doubts (saith he) page 56 *Are to be resolved by the Scriptures, applyed in Christian prudence, and Spiritual Wisdome.* This is strange, That there was neither *Christian prudence* nor *Spiritual Wisdome* in all the whole *General Assembly!*

That

That they ſplit upon ſuch a trivial Queſtion, and never reconciled again to this day: But the cauſe was, *They lacked Wiſdome*, and did not *aſk of GOD who giveth liberally, and upbraideth not*: For had they been *taught of GOD* and received the *Word of Wiſdome* from his *Mouth*, they would have ſeen this contraverſie to be as impertinent as that about *Eaſter* in the *Primitive Church*.

Next in page 39, he ſaith, *The corruptions of men are to be charged with all theſe defects*: This is very true, for the corruptions of men, and chiefly of the Clergie have ſeparated them from knowing, or ſeeking to know the *mind* and *Counſel* of *GOD*, by the teachings of his *Spirit*, and to lean to their own corrupt Wiſdom, their natural and acquired parts, hence ſome of them have not ſtuck to affirm, *that a wicked Reprobate*, a man *void of grace*, *and of the ſpirit of Chriſt*, *may be a ſufficient Miniſter*.

Before I leave his firſt argument, with his *ſpurious definition* of a Rule, I will give him another, which I think he will like the better, becauſe it comes from his brother the Author of *Melius Inquirendum*; Who ſayes, *The mind and will of GOD, however notified to us, is the Rule of*

our obedience. Now if *Patroclus* will prove that the mind and will of GOD was never notified or made known to mankind before *Moſes* wrote the *Pentateuch.* I ſhall grant to him, that the Scriptures are the *primary* or principal Rule, for the words ſignifie no more but firſt, or belonging to firſt, for the two words *Primary* or *Principal* being *Latine* words ſignifie no more but firſt or belonging to firſt, if we believe our *Lexicons.*

To prove that the Scriptures contain the whole Counſel of GOD, he citeth *Acts.* 20, 27. Where *Paul* ſayeth to the Elders of *Epheſus*, *That he had not ſhunned to declare unto them all the Counſel of GOD.* Here obſerve that this was before he had written his Epiſtle to the *Epheſians*, and therefore I intreat *Patroclus* to inform us where we may find *Pauls* Preachings recorded that he mentioneth here, wherein we may find all the *Counſel of GOD*; For it ſeems the Fathers at the Counſel of *Laodicea* have forgotten to add them to the *Cannon.*

His ſecond Argument is thus;

That which was the Principal rule to the *Jews* is the Principal Rule to us: But the Scriptures were the Principal Rule to them,

them, therefore they must be the same to us.

Answer, To begin with his *Major*, he saith it is *Robert Barkclay's*; This is the hight of deceit, disingenuity, and Impudence: For in the second Chapter of his apologie cited by our Author, there is no such word to be found. In this Chapter he chiefly treateth of the formal object of faith, and but little of the Rule, he proveth that indeed that *Divine immediat Revelation* was the formal object of the Faith of the Ancients, and citeth *Noah* and *Abraham* for examples, whom I believe to have had Faith, and also a Rule for their Faith before there was either Scripture or a *Jew* in the World; So that granting the *Major* he gains nothing by it, unless he can prove that the Scripture was the *Primary Rule of Noah and Abrahams Faith*, or else, that GOD hath changed his Rule.

His Minor I deny for the same reason.

Secondly, I acknowledge that *Moses* Law which is a part of the Scripture was more a Rule to the *Jews*, and more binding upon them then upon any of the Nations, or any living either then or since, And this is all that his after reasonings can prove.

But what if I should say with other *Pro-*

teſtant Writers, that the Law was given particularly for that Nation, and was binding upon no other Nation in the World, as *J: Humphry* in his book called *Mediocria*, to which *Richard Baxter* a Famous *Presbyterian*, aſſents and ſubſcrives, I am of the ſame mind. *R: Baxter* of the *Covenants*, " page 14. "The *Old Covenant* is that which " GOD made with the *Jews*, when *Moſes* " led them in the Wilderneſs, the new is " that which we have under the *Goſpel*; the " *Old Covenant* then is not the Covenant " of works, for that was made with all in " *Adam*, and as written in our hearts muſt " be Eternally obligatory; but the *Old* " *Covenant* was made with the *Jews* in " oppoſition to other Nations, and as pe- " culiar to them is vaniſhed & binds not: " And for the ſame reaſon he ſayeth it is " not the *Covenant of Grace*, which is called " the *New Covenant*: But ſaith he, the new is " not the old.

The argument he bringeth to prove his *Minor* is that from which the *Jews* might not ſwerve to the right nor left hand, and to the deciſion of which they were ultimatly bound to ſtand in all doubts and contraverſies, and that upon higheſt pains, was the principal Rule; But from *GOD's Writtin Law*, &c.

Therefore

Therefore to them it was the *Primary Rule.*

Answer, First, This argument proveth no more then this is already granted, *Viz.* That *Moses* Law was a more Principal Law to the *Jews* then to any other Nation. But untill he prove the Children of *Israel* to have had no Law, no Rule of Faith nor Life before *Moses* wrote that Law, his argument can conclude nothing.

Secondly, Mine Adversary may tell me, whether they were to stand to the decision of the Law in a matter which the Law did not decide? for we find that after the Law was given; In many things the Law giver, *Moses*, could not decide without *immediate Revelation*, as in the matter of the Daughters of *Zelophehad*: But when the case was proposed to him, he went and enquired of the Lord; And again, when the Law was finished, and *Joshua* to succeed him. What saith the LORD: *Numb*: 29. 21. *And he (to wit) Joshua) shall stand before Eleazer the Priest, who shall ask Counsel for him after the judgement of Urim before the LORD.* If this be ultimatly to recurr to the Scriptures of *Moses* Law, the Reader may judge.

To prove his *Minor* he citeth one place which

which I cannot omit, *Deut.* 17, 9, 10, 11 *And thou ſhall come unto the Prieſts, the Levits, and unto the Judge that ſhall be in thoſe dayes, and enquire, and they ſhall ſhew thee the Sentence of Judgement, and thou ſhall do according to the ſentence which they of that place* (which the LORD ſhall chooſe) *ſhall ſhew thee, and thou ſhall obſerve to do according to all that they inform thee.* Now Reader, could the *Pope* of *Rome* have ſought out a Scripture more fitt to have eſtabliſhed his univerſal Dictatorſhip over *Chriſtendome* then this? Is there one word of *Scripture*, *Law* or *Teſtimony* here? No, but the *Prieſts*, the *Levites*, and the *Judge*: That is in *Broad Scots*, The General Aſſembly, and Committee of Eſtates, who were as abſolute in their Determinations, as ever the *Pope* and his Conclave: But *Patroclus* muſt know that he and his Brethren are not *Levites*, altho they *take the Tithes*, nor am I to take their Counſel, till they aſſure me that they have the Judgement of *Urim*.

His ſecond Proof for his *Minor* is, *Iſaiah* 8. 20. *To the Law and to the Teſtimony, if they ſpeake not according to theſe, it is becauſe there is no light in them.*

This Scripture hath been ſo much toſſed by

by the Adverſaries of Truth, and ſo often anſwered, That *Patroclus* who promiſeth greater Matters then his Brethren had brought, might have let it alone.

He denyes that this *Law* and *Teſtimony* can be *inward*; And ſayes, *For this Expoſition we muſt take their word*, &c: But he hath forgotten (it ſeems) that *William Penn* in his *Rejoynder* hath given him other Mens words for it, and perhaps better Mens then himſelf; And becauſe the Book is not ſo common among *Presbyterians*; I ſhall here inſert ſome of the *Teſtimonys* cited by *William Peen.*

First *Delk. Tryal of Spirits*, page 16. *Wherefore they who are true believers* (ſaith he) *and have received Chriſts Spirit, their Judgement is to be preferred in the Tryal of ſpirits before a whole councel of Clergie Men:* And *they onlie who can try Spirits by the Spirit of GOD, and Doctrines by the Word of GOD written in their hearts; by the Spirit can in meaſure diſcern all Spirits in the World. And the Spirit of Chriſt which dwelleth in all true Chriſtians cannot deceive, nor be deceived in the tryal of ſpirits.*

Collier: General Epiſtle, page 249. and page 258. *Obj: Iſt*, it is ſaid *Iſa:* 8 20. *To the Law and to the Teſtimony*, &c: *Anſ:*

Truth

Truth; *There is the Law and the Teſtimony in the Spirit as well as in the Letter, The Law of GOD is in the Heart, There it is written and there it teſtifies the Truth of GOD; And if any Man ſpeake not according to this Rule, it is becauſe there is no Light nor Morning ariſen in them. the Spiritual Man judgeth all things, yet he himſelf is judged of no man.*

Theſe were the words of two Famous Profeſſors who were no *Quakers*.

Next he citeth ſome Scriptures to prove that *Moſes* Law is underſtood by the *Law* and *Teſtimony*; As if GOD had made voide his Promiſe, *To write his Law in the Heart*, and *put it in the inward parts:* But of this a little after

In page 35. He begins with a Queſtion drawn from *Deut:* 17. 18, 19. Now (ſayes he) *Shall any be ſo ſtupid as to believe when a doubt aroſe, That the King was not bound to apply himſelf to this written Law for the diſcuſſing thereof?* Or *tho the King's doubt had been moſt clearly diſcuſſed by the Law; He was bound to wait for a miraculous Revelation from Heaven to determine him?* I ſay who in his Witts will believe this? Very well *Patroclus*, I am one ſo ſtupid as to believe that when a doubt aroſe, which *Moſes* Law could not clearly determine, that the King

King was bound to enquire of the LORD; Of which the Scriptures gives us many examples. As 1 *Samuel* 23. 2. 4. and 30: 8. 2 *Sam:* 2. 1. and 5. 19. 1 *Kings* 22. 7. And 2 *Kings* 22. Where the King, the High Prieſt, the Scribe, and ſome others, had the Book of the Law and knew not what to do with it, but ſent to enquire of the Lord, and that by the mouth of a Woman. But he hath been ſo warrie in his ſecond Querie as to add; *Tho the Kings doubt had been moſt clearly diſcuſſed by the Law*; Yet hath not the Candour to tell us, what the King was to do, in caſe his doubt was not clearly diſcuſſed by the Law. As for the word *Miraculous Revelation*, &c: It is his own, a fine bugbear to fright his ſilly Diſciples from asking Counſel of GOD; For I am apt to believe, that Divine Revelation is now a miracle among *Presbyterian Prieſts*.

To trace him in all his Raillings and Boaſtings, reflections againſt *Ro: Barkelay* and *Geo: Keith*, were very needleſs; The Reader may ſee them of no weight. I ſhall therefore here take notice of ſome of the Scriptures cited by him in page 34. To prove that by the *Law* and the *Teſtimonie* is underſtood the Law of *Moſes* written

write on *Exod.* 32. 15. *And Moſes turned, and went down from the Mount, and the two Tables of the Teſtimony were in his hand, &c.* 34. 29. *With the two Tables of Teſtimony in Moſes hand, &c.*

Now I beſeech the Reader to conſider what this Man can make from hence, or from any of the reſt, to prove that *Iſaiah* meant the two *Tables of the Law* to be a *Primarie Rule* either to *Jews* or *Chriſtians*. Was never the *Moral Law* a Law to Mankind, until it was written in Tables of Stone? Then certainly *Cain* had not ſinned in killing of *Abell*; If there had been no Law againſt Murther; Or what more can he make of this Scripture (if he make the *Law* and *Teſtimonie* to be the *Ten Commandements*?) But this, That whoever ſpeaketh or acteth contrary unto them; *It* is becauſe he is dark, not knowing the Mind of the LORD; nor hearkning to the Voice of the *Divine Light* in him, which would have taught him to ſpeak and act according to that *Moral Law*.

But I would willingly learn of him, whether he would have the whole Law of *Moſes*, *Moral*, *Judicial*, and *Levitical*, or *Ceremonial*, to be the *Primarie Rule* to *Chriſtians* now a dayes: For the *Moral* is confeſſed

teſſed by all parties to be binding upon all Mankind, and that it was Imprinted upon the Souls of all Men, even before it was written: But the *Judicial Law* as well as the *Ceremonial Law* hath been rejected by all Chriſtians, except the *Presbyterians*, who compoſed *Cargils Covenant*. What then would the man be at? I can conjecture nothing but this; The *Presbiterians* have three beloved Doctrines, *Viz: Swearing*, *Fighting*, and *Tithes*, which no one Line of the *New Teſtament* ſeems to favour, and therefore they would have the Law reinforced, leaſt theſe their Darlings fall.

To conclude: *The Law was added*, (ſaith *Paul*) becauſe of *Tranſgreſſion*. Therefore there was a Law or Rule tranſgreſſed before this Law was added: And that it was a Written Law, let *Patroclus* prove with the next.

I ſhall now come to his third Argument, page 39. Chriſt and his Apoſtles "proved their Doctrines from the *Scriptures* "referred their hearers unto them, for the "final deciſion of the moſt grave and "weighty Controverſies that ever aroſe "in the World; And lent all people in-"to them as a moſt ſure and undeceiving "Light, by the Guiding of which we may

paſ-

" pass through this dark World, and be " kept from Hell in the close: *Ergo*, the " Scriptures are the *Primary Rule*, &c.

To prove the Consequence of this Argument, he sendeth us to the Definition of (*a may be*) Rule in his first Argument; which is proven to be lame, and a begging of the Question.

Next to prove his *Antecedent*, he citeth a Bundle of Scriptures, formerly adduced by his Brethren, and answered divers times: But he thinks all the rest but Bunglers, and therefore he will have at them again.

The *First* is, *Mat.* 22. 29, 31, 32. *Ye do err not knowng the Scriptures, nor the Power of GOD.*

He begins with a parcel of *Presbyterian Rhetorick*, saying, Our Adversaries *are like Baits*, &c. Let the Reader judge, whether I have occasion here for a Repartee, but I'le spare him.

There be Two Things in the Citation, for the Ignorance of which the *Jews* are blamed, to wit, Of the Scriptures and the Power of God. Now if this prove one of them to be a Rule, it cannot miss to prove the other to be a Rule also: And so the Controversy remains in *statu quo prius*, that is, Whether the Scriptures, or Christ the

the power of God, and the Wiſdom of God, Teaching and Revealing the Mind and Will of God to his People, is to be preferred. The *Quakers* never denied the Scriptures to be a Rule, but only that they were ſubordinat to the Teachings of Chriſt by His Spirit, Whom He promiſeth to ſend, and that he ſhould Teach them all Things: And this I ſay is preferrable, and he hath brought nothing to prove the contrary.

This cleareth *George Keith* from what he allegeth, of his confounding the *Rule with the Power*: And as for his *Simile* of *Euclid*, it will nothing mend his Matter; for certainly *Euclid* had a Rule by which he wrote his Book, which was the Dictats of his *Reaſon*; and except his Propoſitions can be demonſtrated to me by Reaſon, I am not bound to believe them. Therefore the Dictats of my Reaſon are a more Noble and Excellent Rule to me than *Euclid*'s Propoſitions, tho the Book be an excellent Help for me to attain to that Art.

And whereas he hath talked very diſdainfully, though wrongfully, of confounding the Scriptures and the Power of God, he ſhould have remembred that in Page 36. He hath ſaid, *That to ſeek to the Scrip-*

Scriptures is all one with ſeeking unto GOD: Whether this vergeth upon Blaſphemy, let the Reader Judge.

But to put our Stupidity or prejudice beyond doubt, he brings us another ſimile of a King.

Anſwer, Above all things he ſhould have ſhunned diſcourſing upon this *Topick*; For it is impoſſible to keep a *Presbyterian Prieſt* within his Bounds: Here he hath deſcribed a King in *Querpo*, ſubordinate to the Laws and limited by them.

Whereas it is well known, That the King is the fountain of our Law, our *Legiſlator*: And by the ſame Authority whereby he *makes* Laws, can *caſhier annul* and reſcind them: And it is a known *Maxim* in Law, *Rex non poteſt peccare*; But this is the old Doctrine of *Lex Rex*, and *Jus Populi*: And that famous peece, *The Hynd let looſe.*

Now if this his Simile prove any thing, it will be this, That as (according to their Dialect) *The King can do nothing but what the Law of the Land allows*: So GOD can do nothing but what the Scripture allows: And conſequently CHRIST could not command the Man to take up his Bed and walk

walk upon the Sabbath day, becauſe no Scripture then written allowed it.

The next place is, *John* 5. 39. Here he challengeth R. B. as a *Papiſt*, for ſaying the Words ought to have been Tranſlated, *Ye ſearch the Scriptures*: But *Patroclus*, If I ſhall cite *Bellarmine* againſt the payment of Tiths (who ſay they, *Are not due by any Law of GOD or Nature, ſince the coming of Chriſt*) Will thou alſo call me a *Papiſt*? If thou do, thou art miſtaken; And ſo art thou in him. And when thou can prove that there are no errors in the Tranſlation, thou may ſtick by this. The Scriptures thou brings prove nothing for this Tranſlation, for they do not mention it; And we never denyed it, that the reading of the Scripture was both commanded and commended; Yet thou art not aſhamed to ſay, *They are ſufficient to convince theſe Men of palpable falſhood and blaſphemy.* This is Language for the Pulpit among the Hood-winked hearers, but will trouble no unprejudiced Reader.

As to the great ſtreſs he layeth upon theſe words, *And theſe are they that teſtifie of me*; Therefore they are the *Primary Rule.* Did he not ſay, *The Works which I do, they bear witneſs of Me?* And if we may believe Hil-

History, the *Sybills* testified of him: Doth this prove that they were the *Primary Rule?*

But the very foregoing Verse is to be considered, *And ye have not his Word abiding in you, for whom he hath sent, him ye believe not.* And verse 36. *I have a greater Witness then that of John; For the works which the Father hath given me to finish, the same works that I do bear witness of me, that the Father hath sent me.* Here let him consider, that in the mouth of two or three Witnesses, every thing is to be proven. Our Saviour bringeth here four Witnesses, The *Testimony* of *John*, The *Works which he did*, The *Word of GOD abiding in Men*, and the *Scriptures*. The contraversy is not whether any of these or all of them were Witnesses, but which of them was the greatest and most Preferrable? And if the Works which He then did were a greater Witness then the *Testimony of John* (who was inferiour to none of the Prophets) Then the Works which He now doth in the Hearts and Souls of Believers by His Word abiding in them, in healling all their Infirmities, quickning and enlightning their dead Souls, and speaking peace

to

to them; *it a greater Witneſs* then the *Scriptures.*

He falls next upon R. Bs. *Dilemma*, Which he ſaith, *hath not the weight of a Wal-nut*; It ſeems the hardneſs of the ſhell hath blunted his teeth, that he hath not reached the Kernal. For (ſaith he) *If the words are to be taken in the Imperative mood, as we have even now demonſtrated, then it is as clear as the Noon Sun*, &c.

But how hath he demonſtrated it? That the Word bears not the Indicative Signification; as well as the Imperative, is obvious to any that underſtands the Conjugations. And the Scriptures brought to prove it, I ſhall touch ſome of them *Deut:* 17. 18, 19. *And he ſhall read therein all the days of his Life: Ergo*, The Words *John* 5: 39. Are to be taken in the *Imperative Mood.* If this be not as wild a conſequence as to ſay *William Jamiſon* is *verus Patroclus* by a *Metempſychoſis*, *Ergo*, The whole Church of *England* are *Hereticks*, (which he hath boldly aſſerted in his *Adultory* Epiſtle to his Patron) I leave it to the Reader to Judge.

The next he brings is, *Deut:* 29. 29. *The Secret things belong to the LORD our GOD, but thoſe Things which are revealed*

belong to us and to our Children for ever, that we may do all the Words of this Law. Ergo, The Words of *John* are to be taken in the *Imperative mood*; Who would follow ſuch an Adverſary at this Rate?

But ſeeing he is ſo good at Wall-nuts, I will give him another of the ſame kind to break,

Either the Words of *John the Baptiſt*, (who was as great a Prophet as *Iſaiah*) were as much a Rule to the *Jews* when ſpoken by him, as they are now to us when recorded in a Book, or as the words of *Iſaiah* formerly recorded in a Book; or they were not? If they were, Then the Works which Chriſt worketh now in the Souls of His Servants, muſt be a greater Witneſs then the words of *John* recorded in a Book; As well as the Works he then did were a greater Witneſs.

But if he ſay, they were *not ſo much a Rule when ſpoken, as when written.* I ask him, how they came by that excellency by being Written? Or was it the Council of *Laodicea* that gave it?

Page 43 He ſaith, *He hath broken one of the Horns of his Dilemma, and made his Conſequence a meer Nonſequitor.* And why? Becauſe he hath confeſſed (ſaith he) in a word

" word, That the Words of Christ and his " Apostles, as then spoken & now record- " ed in Scripture, were of themselves no less " binding upon the *Jews*, then these spoken " by *Moses* and the *Prophets*.

But this hath strengthned the *Dilemma*, for if they were as binding, and yet needed a Rule to try them by; Then the Writtings of *Moses* and the Prophets needed a Rule to try them by, and that Rule another Rule; *Et sic infinitum.*

That all Doctrines of Men may be tryed, and ought so to be by the Scriptures, was never denyed; And hath no way given away his Cause. But as for what follows, That it might be lawful to imbrace any impulse or suggestion, which he thought was the Spirit of GOD; Without further Examination thereof, is a gross untruth, but ordinary to him and his Brethren; And therefore he hath wisely foreborn to tell us where *R: Barkelay* said so.

His third Scripture is, *Acts* 17. 11. He saith, *His Adversaries can find nothing to darken and deprive it, and therefore he waves it.* Not being willing to meddle with what R: B: saith there: *To wit*, If the *Bereans* were oblidged to believe and receive *Pauls*

Teſtimony, becauſe he preached the Truth to them by Authority from GOD; Then their uſing them, or his commending of them for uſing the ſcriptures; Will not prove the ſcriptures to be the *Primary Rule*, Yea more a Rule than the Doctrine they tryed by it. For if the Doctrine preached by *Paul* to the *Bereans*, had been but recorded in a Book, it had preſently become a *Primary Rule*.

The fourth is, 2 *Peter* 1. 19. *We have a more ſure word of propheſie*, &c. This place he will have to be meant of the ſcriptures. His firſt prooff is, Becauſe (ſaith he) *This preſuppoſeth, that there cannot be immediat Revelation where the ſenſes go along: And ſo their ſpirit is contrary to ſenſe.*

But this is an old Cavil againſt *Chriſtianity*, and brought on the ſtage by *Julian* the *Apoſtat*, in his Book againſt the *Primitive Chriſtians*. This Doctrine (ſaid he) *fighteth againſt common ſenſe*: See *Chron: Carionis*, page 278.

To this he addeth another, *Why ſhould this Glorious Viſion of which the Apoſtles had Divine and infallible Evidence*, &c: *Be accounted uncertain and ſuſpected in reſpect of the Spirit? Anſwer*, Why ſh uld it be uncertain and ſuſpected in reſpect of the ſcriptures?

And

And why ſhould it become the *Primary Rule* when recorded in a Book, and not the Rule when ſpoken immediatly on the Mount; If thou ſay, Becauſe it is more obvious to ſenſe, then it ſeems thy Religion is more ſenſual than Spiritual.

His ſecond Argument is, *That this Revelation* (according to us) *brings along with it its own ſelf Evidence, and perſwades the Soul to embrace and cloſe with it as Divine*: But this is both groundleſs, and therefore falſe (ſaith he) becauſe we aſſert, *that unleſs the Underſtanding be well diſpoſed, Revelation tho immediate, is not evident.*

Anſwer firſt, He here brings nothing to prove this, That it is groundleſs and falſe; except his *ipſe dixit*; And therefore I may not take his word.

Secondly, What had all the *Patriarchs* before *Moſes Law*, and even *Moſes* himſelf to try their Revelations by? Yet they believed them upon their own ſelf evidence: Yea, *Balaam* who had no well diſpoſed Intellect, yet knew and believed his Revelations to be Divine. And *Laſtly*, Doctor *Barron* in his Book againſt *Turnbul*, ſaith, *That the moſt noble kind of Revelation is, that which is by intellectual ſpeaking or illumination, as* Thomas *and* Swarez *teach.*

Thirdly, He ſaith, We inſinuate, *That*

the Apoſtle in this Compariſon, gave out that one of the things compared was more certain than the other; *Which* (ſaith he) *is moſt falſe*; Seing conſidered in themſelves, both have all certainly poſſible. But in reſpect of us (ſaith he) *The Scriptures are more ſure, becauſe leſs ſubject to be counterfeited or wreſted either by the Devil or our own fancie*; But here (it ſeems) he hath forgotten himſelf, for this ſame Apoſtle hath told us that the Scripture can be wreſted. But who, ſaith that the teachings of the Spirit of truth can be ſo? None but *Patroclus*; And ſo the compariſon holds, that which can be wreſted is leſs ſure then that which cannot be wreſted. He adds, the Apoſtle hath his eye upon his Country men; And ſo have I upon mine, who pretend ſo much to the Scriptures, and yet wreſt them groſly to their own damnation.

Page, 46. comes to prove, that by theſe words (*more ſure word of Propheſie*) are meant the Scriptures; after he hath told us that albeit *immediat Revelation* were meant or underſtood by the more ſure word of Propheſie, it would be no advantage to us, becauſe it is recommended to us: As that whereby we may come to the genuine

genuine interpretation of the Scriptures, and ſo not the *principal rule*, but a means to explain the *principal Rule*, and for this he brings no proof, but we muſt take his word, and then he will make us *Quid libet ex quo libet*.

Firſt, He ſaith, by theſe words *a more ſure word of Propheſie*, is underſtood the Scriptures, becauſe any phraſe of the like import is alwayes taken for the Scriptures, as *Luke* 16, 29. *Eph:* 2. 20. *Matt.* 7. 12. And yet he confeſſeth in a Parentheſis, the words *Logos Propheticos*, are not to be found in all the Scripture beſides, but by the words *Law* and *Prophets* are meant the Scriptures; *Ergo*, by the more ſure word of Propheſie are meant the Scriptures: This is a *non ſequitur*, with a witneſs.

The reſt of his arguments, ſuch as, if our Adverſarys were not affronted, and impudently bold, ſuch as would adventure upon any thing, *&c.* and the like; Are not worthy of any anſwer: But ſeeing he would explain one Scripture by another, I will help him to one more fit, *John* 1. 4, 5. Where it is ſaid, *In Him was Life, and the Life was the Light of men, and the Light ſhineth in the darkneſs, and the darkneſs comprehended it not.* How like this is to the more

ſure *word of Propheſie*, which ſhineth as a Light in a dark place; But the life of CHRIST, the light in men, is a *ſcare Crow* to *Presbyterian Prieſts*, they cannot abide it One reaſonleſs reaſon he gives us, is, becauſe men are commended for ſearching the Scriptures; But I would be obliged to him if he would form a Syllogiſm upon the *medium*, and draw his concluſion from it.

In *page* 48 he tells us, that *Luther*, *Calvin*, &c. Underſtand it ſo. Is this fare dealing *Patroclus*? Doſt thou agree with *Luther*, or even with *Calvin* in all things? If thou ſay yea, I'le prove the contrary, and yet their Teſtimony muſt oblige us; Then he computes us among Ancient *Hereticks*, but he would not be ſatisfied if I ſhould compute him and his brethren among *Mahumitans* for beliving a Stoical Fate. *Laſtly*, He leaveth us to graple with *William Penn's Rejoynder*, *page*, 334, who, he ſayeth, yieldeth to him what we deny.

To ſatisfie the Reader, I ſhall ſet down ſome of *William Penns* words; He ſayeth, *John Faldo* acknowledgeth, *That the writings of the Prophets are not more true in themſelves than any other Revelation of the mind of GOD, but more certain*

certain with reſpect to the Jews, *who had a greater eſteem for, and teſtimony of the writings of the* Prophets *to be of* GOD, *and not a deluſion, then of* Peters *Revelation*; So that we here have (ſaith *William* Penn) from *John Faldo* himſelf; *The ſcripture is not ſet above the Spirit as the more ſure word, the thing promoted of old by our enemies, and which we only oppoſe:* For I doubt not but the Scriptures were more ſure to the *Jews* then CHRIST Himſelf, elſe they would never have thought to find Eternal life in them, whilſt they neglected, yea perſecuted him; Which, whether it was their perfection or imperfection, ſo to do, I leave with the judgement of my ſerious Reader, which I likewayes do whether *Patroclus* be a fair adverſary or any honeſt man.

He comes next to *Luke* 16. 31. *If they hear not Moſes and the* Prophets, *neither will they be perſwaded thô one roſe from the dead.*

Firſt, Let the Reader obſerve that this is a Parable, and that the *Presbyterians* believe that any ſuch apparitions are but Devils aſſuming the body, or the ſhape of the dead: And therefore any thing may be more certain to them then ſuch a Teſtimony, and we read of none ſuch but that of *Samuel* to *Saul*.

Secondly,

Secondly, This Scripture brings no compariſon betwixt the Scripture and the Spirit, and whereas he ſaith, let the *Quakers prove that every man hath ſuch a ſpirit as the Quakers alledge, this ſhall come in its own place.*

Next he proveth the Scriptures to be the *primary Rule*, becauſe otherwiſe *Abraham* might have ſaid, the Spirit of GOD directeth every man immedialy; If they hear not him they will hear none elſe: If *Abraham* ſaid ſo (it ſeems *Patroclus* would have been diſpleaſed; But a greater then *Abraham* ſaid ſo, even the *LORD JESUS John*, 14. 26. *But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghoſt, whom the Father will ſend in my Name, he ſhall teach you all things*, whoſe teaching are preferable to all the writings in the world, ſeeing he taught them what they wrote, and their being dictated by him, giveth them all their excellency.

He ſaith *R: Barkelay* ſaying, *The Scriptures were a written Rule to the Jews only, is nothing to the purpoſe*, but he ſhould not have belyed him, for he ſaith, *they were a more principal Rule to the Jews; But never that they were a principal Rule to the Jews.* He paſſeth by what he ſaid upon the Scripture, *Viz. Page*, 40. This Parable was uſed by Chriſt to the *Jews*, to ſhew them their *Hypocriſie*; who albeit they de-

deceitfully pretended to reverence and follow *Moſes* and the Prophets; Yet they did not really hear them, elſe they would have acknowledged him, of what *Moſes* & the Prophets did ſo clearly write, ſince he did as great and convincing Miracles before them, as if they had the Teſtimony of one Riſen from the Dead.

In like manner the *Presbyterians* now, albeit they pretend ſo much to reverence the writings of the Apoſtles, yet they will not really hear them, elſe they would not *fight*, *ſwear*, nor exact a *forced maintainance*, even from theſe who are not of the communion of their Church.

His *Third* argument is, *Certainly* (ſaith he) *the voice of one of the Glorified Spirits coming from Heaven, where they behold the Face of GOD, is no leſs to be accounted immediate Revelation, then the voice of the high Prieſt unto the people*, &c. But he ſhould have proved that GOD took this method to reveal his mind unto his people, which he never did: But the High Prieſt was a *Type of Chriſt*, and a *Mediator betwixt GOD and the Jews*: So that to deny this to be immediate, becauſe it was firſt ſpoken to the High Prieſt, is to deny the words of Chriſt to be immediate to his people, be-

cauſe

cauſe he ſaith, he had *heard and received them of the Father*; or that the light of the Sun is not immediate, becauſe it is conveyed to us through the Air. Only let him tell me, whether the ſupream Magiſtrate who is at preſent troubled with the clamours of the two kinds of Clergy-men in *Scotland*, can go and inquire of the LORD, and have as certain an anſwer, which of the two Church Government are *Jure Divino*, as the *Jews* many times had, and then he ſayes ſomething? For the *Jews* had the Scriptures, *Moſes* and the Prophets as well as we, and yet were many times neceſſitat to go and enquire of the LORD, which evidently proves they had a higher rule then *Moſes* Law.

In *page* 50, he giveth an argument like the reſt, *Viz. Gods way of Revealing himſelf to us, is as immediat as it was to the Jews, becauſe we have thoſe that were inſpired by GOD, ſpeaking to us tho Dead.* Hence he concludes, that the Scriptures are as immediat to us as the voice of *Moſes*, or the High Prieſt, or the Prophets was to the *Jews*.

This Argument is ſingular for deceit & folly; For *Firſt*, where did any *Quaker* deny the Scriptures to be the *Primary Rule* upon the account of their not being immediatly

revealed

revealed we acknowledege that they were immediatly revealed to the Prophets and Apoſtles,& recorded by them,but this doth not let them above theSpirit which did reveal them,and ſo his groſs lie and his argument are both anſwered;and yet he might have conſidered that the promiſe of Chriſt is more full to his people then it was to the *Jews*; As he may read,*Matt:* 10: 19, 20. *It ſhall be given you the ſame hour what ye ſhall ſpeak, for it is not ye that ſpeak, but the Spirit of your Father that ſpeaketh in you.*

His fourth argument from 2 *Tim.* 3. 15. Is, *That which is able to make ſuch an one as Timothy, called the man of GOD, wiſe through faith unto Salvation, muſt be a ſufficient Rule,* &c. *But the Scriptures are able to do ſo,* &c. *Therefore they are a ſufficient Rule.*

Anſwer, This argument militates nothing againſt us, for the Queſtion is not, whether the Scriptures be a Rule, but whether they be the *Primary Rule,* which this Argument toucheth not, and Faith is added here as a *principal ingredient,* which themſelves acknowledge to be a work of the Spirit, this Faith hath a rule; as alſo that faith, whereby a man believes the *Divine Authority* of the Scriptures, let him tell me with the next, what is the *Rule of this Faith?*

He

He tells next, The ſcriptures are *Cauſa exemplaris*, and therefore the *Primary Rule*, they call them *cauſa formalis*, *Cauſa materialis*, *cauſa exemplaris*; And the word *make* would ſeem to make them *cauſa efficiens*, ſo that according to them, they are, *To Pan*, and the Spirit *Vere Nihil*.

From the Scriptures being *Cauſa exemplaris*, he ſaith, I evidently inferr that they are the *adequat* & *Primary Rule*, becauſe if there were ſome things to be believed and practiſed not contained in Scripture: Or if they were ſubject to another Teſt, &c. They could not in truth be called *able to make the man of GOD wiſe unto Salvation*. This I have anſwered before, if he underſtand the Eſſentials and fundamentals of the *Chriſtian Religion*; It is confeſſed, they do contain them, but there are many things occur in our *Chriſtian courſe* (as he words it) which the Scriptures do not determine. Such as whether it was *Chriſtian* or *Antichriſtian courſe for the Presbyterians to come up to Bothwel-Bridge to fight againſt the King*. And *Secondly*, Whether the late aſſembly ought to have united with their Brethren of the *Epiſcopal perſwaſion*, till they had undergone *Pennance* for their *Apoſtaſie* upon the Stool of Repentance.

The

The *First* brought much trouble upon the Nation, and the *Second* is feared to be of no better conſequence, except our Author bring us clear Scripture to determine the caſe, to the ſatisfaction of all parties.

He ſaith *little Juſtice. Truth*, or *fare dealing is to be expected from us*, But far leſs from him ſo long as he truſts more to *Ariſtotles Elenebis* in frameing deceitful Sophiſms, then to the Teſtimony of the Spirit of Chriſt; the reaſon he gives for this great calumny is, becauſe R. B. accuſeth his brother *John Brown* for perverting the Scripture. 2 *Tim*: 3. 16. Now it is evident that the 16, *Ver*: hath no ſuch word in it, and that the 17 *Verſ* ſaith only, *That the man of GOD may be perfect*; So the difference here is very obvious, which R. B. hath largely handled in the ſame 41 page, and our Author takes no notice of it, but moſt deceitfully inſinuates that he makes the ſcriptures *Tautologies*, becauſe he cannot evite the diſtinction there made by R. B. To which place (never touched by our Author) I refer my Reader.

Laſtly, (ſaith he) *For we love rather to plead by weight of Arguments then by multitude of Arguments. Anſwer*, If this had been true, thou had ſpared a dale of Paper and pains.

We

We evince (saith he) *That the Scriptures are a compleat adequate and Primary Rule of Faith and Manners, by the Testimony of our Adversaries themselves.*

Answer, If this be true, it is manifest that all he hath said on that Subject, is superfluous: Against whom did the Man write? O mercileſs Adverſarie This is like the *Papists* in Q: *Marys* time: Tho you recant and be received into the Church, yet you muſt burn! But let us hear what he saith?

His Proofs are theſe, *First*, *R: Barkclay's Vindication*, page 36. *The chief Doctrines of Christianity are contained in Scripture*, And we may find the whole Doctrine of the Christian Faith in the Scriptures; And *George Keith* saith, *That the Scriptures are a full enough declaration of all Doctrines and Principles*, &c.

Both theſe I have cleared before granting all that they said; And yet have proven that many things may and do occurr, which the Scriptures do not clearly determine.

The other Branch that they are the *Primary Rule*, *Our Adverſaries themſelves* (saith he) *at unawares grant.* Very well *Patroclus*, it is a fine trick of a Souldier to take

take his Enemies napping and vanquish by ſtratagem, but it ſeems there is ſome difficulty in it.

He citeth *R: Barkelays 2d. Theſes*, ſaying, *That the Spirit is not to be ſubjected to the Scriptures as a more noble Rule*; Therefore (ſaith he) *The Spirit is to be ſubjected to the Scriptures, tho not as a more noble Rule.*

Anſwer firſt, He ſhould have ſaid, Theſe Divine Revelations, for they are the words of the *Theſe*; But we have often acknowledged that all Doctrines of Men, how holy ſoever, or how much ſoever they pretend to the Spirit, are to be tryed by the Scriptures, and if they be contrary to them are to be rejected; But this proves nothing of their being the *Primary Rule* to us, more then to *Enoch* who was a Man of GOD, and had true Faith, and walked with GOD before there was a line of Scripture in the World.

Again, (he ſaith) *Our Adverſaries grant that the Scriptures proceeded from GOD, and therefore are infalible, and more ſure than infalible is impoſſible.* This is a ſtrange Argument. The Scriptures are infallible becauſe they proceeded from GOD, or were inſpired by the Spirit of GOD; And ſhall the Inſpiration of the Spirit be fallible, or a more uncertain Rule then that which it

dictated? These words sound harshly But I expect when *Patroclus* comes to be serious in cold Blood, he will grant, That if there be more or less in the Case of Infallibility, he will grant the more to the Spirit which dictated the Scriptures, and from which they derive all their Infallibility, Certainty, and Excellency.

Here I desire the Reader may observe, that his Arguments and the Scriptures cited by him, tend only to set up *Moses* Law to be the *Primary Rule* of Faith and Life; And not one word of the Scriptures of the *New Testament*, so that he contends for *Judaism* rather then *Christianity*. For Christ said, *It hath been said of Old, an Eye for an Eye*, &c: But I say unto you resist not evil, &c: So that the *Jewish* Law is not in all things to be a Rule for Christians; Otherwayes *Patroclus* may offer Sacrifice as well as take Tithes.

In page 54. 55, and 56. He ranteth and roareth against R: B: as a *Jesuite*, because (he alledgeth) he hath taken an Argument of *Bellarmines* to prove the Scriptures not to be an *Adequate Rule*, but what a silly kind of Reasoning this is, (tho true) may easily appear. *Bellarmine* sayes, *there is one GOD*, so do I, therefore I am a *Jesuite*. The *Jesuites* say, *That Dominion*

mission is founded upon Grace; And so do the *Presbyterians*; Therefore the *Presbyterians are Jesuites.*

Then he comes to vindicate *John Brown*'s simile of *killing a Man*; And at last giveth us, the Law, the Judge, and the Witnesses: *The Scriptures are* (saith he) *the Rule whereby to make the Examen, the enlightned Conscience the Judge, the Spirit of Adoption, or a filial Disposition*, &c: *Together the renewed Spirit of the Believer himself the Witnesses.*

But first, I must ask him, whether it be the Man himself, or the Judge that needs this Spiritual Wisdome, and Christian prudence to apply the Rule?

Secondly, Whether the Judge be a Person distinct from the person judged, for (to use his own *Simile*) If the Man shall yet be his own Judge, he is not like to suffer.

Thirdly, What he meaneth by the Exposition he gives us of the Spirit of Adoption; As if he thinketh it nothing else but a Filial Disposition, inclining the Believer to come to GOD, as his Words imply.

Behold Reader, what a Judgement is here to be expected; Where the Man

himself dissected into so many Parts, is the Applyer of the Rule, the Judge and the Witnesses. And yet in page 57 He confesseth, That for the infallible Assurance of the Person himself, the thing standeth in need of, or requireth an inward Judge, and inward Witnesses; Which I hope must be things distinct from the Person himself to whom they are to give infallible certainty.

As for his pretending, *That it belongeth not properly to a Rule of Faith to tell a Man whether he hath true Faith or not, is not to the purpose; For an adequate Rule of Faith must put me beyond doubting what I am to believe, and what not; Otherwayes it is no adequate Rule.* And to conclude, I would advise him to be sparing in calling Men *Anti-Christian*: For I know no people, except the *Papists* to whom the definition of *Antichrist* given by the Apostles, is more agreeable then to the *Presbyterians*. That is, *He exalteth himself above all that is called God*, or the civil Magistrates, who are called *Gods* in Scripture, *Goodman* saith, *they may kill wicked Princes as monsters, and cruel beasts.*

Knox History Fol: 78. *If neither the Magistrate nor the people do their office in deposing or killing the King, then the Minister must Excom-*

communicat ſuch a King. Goodman, page 110. *Any privat Man may do it againſt the greateſt Prince: A privat Man, having ſome ſpecial motion, may kill a Tyrant!*

If theſe *Doctrines* be not more like *Anti-Chriſt*, than the Doctrine he accuſeth, let the Reader judge.

In *Page* 57 he cometh to another Argument of *R. B's*, *There are many things that the Scripture cannot determine.* To which I: B: Anſwers, *That General Rules are enough, leaving the reſt to Chriſtian prudence, and Wiſdome!* If this be not flatly to contradict the Scriptures concerning the chief Inſtances cited by R: B: Let the Reader judge after he hath read and conſidered the following Scriptures.

Rom. 8: 16. *The Spirit it ſelf beareth Witneſs with our ſpirits, that we are the Children of GOD.*

1 John 4. 13. *Hereby do we know that we dwell in Him, and He in us, becauſe He hath given us of his Spirit,* And Verſ. 5.6. *And it is the Spirit that beareth Witneſs, becauſe the Spirit is Truth.*

To theſe *Scriptures* cited by R: B: He hath not anſwered one Word: But all his Anſwers are *Quibles.* As firſt, *If we need Revelation for ſpiritual Actions, we need them alſo for Natural Actions.* Poor Man! Are we

contending for a Rule for Eating and Drinking (as he talks) If he be ſick, let him conſult the Phyſician, what and when he ſhall Eat: But if he mean the Faſts appointed by the *Presbyterian Clergie*, his Brethren of the EPISCOPAL *Perſwaſion* have need to conſult an higher *Oracle*. And when he is hungry and thirſty, his ſtomach can teach him. Nevertheleſs, *Whether we eat or drink, we are to do it to the Glorie of GOD.*

His *ſecond Anſwer* is ridiculous, alledging that a ſyſtem of *Mathematicks* or *Military Diſcipline* is a ſufficient *Rule*, tho the Books comprehended not the Names of all Mathematicians and Souldiers that ever ſhall exiſt. But the Queſtion is, Whether a ſyſtem of theſe Arts can put a Man beyond doubting in every Emergent that may occurr in theſe Arts when practiſed? And not whether their Names be there or not. As whether he is to take upon him to be General of an Army, as R: B. tells his Adverſary, page 45. of his Vindication. The Queſtion is, how *James* and *Peter* knew they ſhould take upon them to Rule? But in caſe theſe ſyſtems faile to ſatisfie a Man at a ſtrait (which I hope any experienced Souldier will confeſs

feſs, and the daily new Inventions do fully evince) What then is the Souldier to recurr to? Is it not to that by which the firſt Man wrote the Syſtem, That is, his Reaſon; And ſee if that can help him when his Book cannot: Yea, have there not been good Souldiers who could neither Read nor Write? Yes, General *Leſly*, who did more for the *Presbyterian* Intereſt then *Patroclus* and *Achilles* both can do. And will a Mathematician receive a Mathematical Propoſition ſet down in a Syſtem hand over head, without ſatisfying his Reaſon? Theſe are poor ſimiles, and rather hurtful then helpful to his Cauſe; If by theſe he minds to prove, *That humane prudence can aſſure a man that he is a Child of God.* I am apt to ſuſpect by his Book that he hath never troden this narrow Path himſelf; Elſe he would have ſpoken other Language. Next he comes to anſwer for his Brethren the *Remonſtrants* and *publick Reſolutioners*, comparing them (indeed) to *Paul* and *Barnabas*: But he hath forgot to tell us which of them was in the right, and to decide the Contraverſie by plain Scripture to the ſtopping the mouths of the other Party, but I doubt this would have puzled his prudence. As for his Inſtance of *Paul* and

Barnabas, their contention was not for matters of Faith or Doctrine as *Beza* teſtifieth, and the Scripture ſaith no where that they did not meet again; But our Aſſembly Men never reconciled to this day.

But knowing this will not do, he giveth a better Anſwer, Saying, *The Corruptions of Men are only to be charged with this.*

Ah! Lamentable, The whole *General Aſſemblie* of the *Church of Scotland* corrupt men: What guides then had ſuch poor *Laicks* as I? But all this ſaith nothing, except he decide the Contraverſy by plain Scripture; Which when he hath done, I ſhall ſay, It's pity he was not preſent at the *Aſſembly*.

Next he falls upon ſome other Arguments, which he tells us *are ſcraped out of Bellarmine*, and therefore deſerve no Anſwer. Which Anſwer, whether true or falſe I know not, having never read *Bellarmines* Works: But I find this is a fair ſhift to win off, and an Habergeon proof againſt any Dart.

He ſpendeth his whole page 60. on Reflections, Firſt on *James Naylor*; he might have remembered *Major Weir*. But *De mor-*

montuis nill, &c: I diſdain to ſcrape in that *Dung-hill*.

Next he compares us to the *Papiſts*, ſaying, As the *Papiſts* to cover the reſt of their Abominations, have invented a greater and more dangerous than them all, that is, *Their Churches Infallibility*: So this Spirit of the *Quakers*, knowing that upon tryal he will be found to be a Counterfeit, hath taken the Counſel given by *Alcibiades* to *Pericles*, that is, To ſtudy how he may ſecure himſelf with the hazard of a Tryal. And here he cites *William Penn*'s *Rejoinder*, *Part.* 1. *Chap.* 5. about the Man of *Philippi*.

I beſeech the Reader to peruſe the place cited by him, that he may ſee him paſt all ſhame, or care of being reputed an honeſt Man. For *Firſt* he ſays, *W. Penn* uſeth it as an Argument to prove, *The Scriptures cannot be a Rule of Faith and Life*; whereas in the ſame Page, *W. Penn* hath owned them for a Rule of Faith and Life, tho' not the Rule by way of Excellency, nor, as *Patroclus* ſaith, the *Primary Rule*.

Secondly, He makes no Argument of it, but an Inſtance, as he doth that of *Ananias* and *Saphira*, That the Scriptures could not be a Rule to *Peter* nor *Paul* in theſe caſes; as he doth that alſo of flying or

ſtand-

ſtanding in the time of Perſecution; and asketh what do Profeſſors mean, when they advite People to ſeek the Lord in this or the other Caſe? Why do they not go ſeek the Scriptures rather? and much more, which for brevity I omit.

To evite all which, he makes a Nonſenſical Argument, and denies the *Antecedent* when he had none. And then falls a Railing for a whole Page together, a part whereof I have ſet down above.

For Anſwer to which: *Firſt*, The *Quakers* own no other Spirit but the *Comforter*, whom *Chriſt* promiſed to ſend to Reprove the World for Sin (for they never refuſed to ſubject the Spirits and Doctrines of Men to the Scriptures) and therefore if he have called the *Spirit of Truth* a Counterfiet, the juſt God will Rebuke him for his Blaſphemy. And this poor Man, who can pretend to no more Infallibility than the *Phariſees* of old, (who had the Scriptures as well as he, and yet were found guilty of Blaſphemy againſt the *Holy Ghoſt*) may be affraid he be found in the ſame Caſe with them. But I wiſh he may find Repentance.

Secondly, The *Presbyterians* may be no leſs fitly compared with the *Papiſts*: For their

their Doctrines being tryed by the Scriptures, they being Interpreters themselves, it is a meer sham to speak of a Tryal: For whatever Interpretation doth not agree with the Analogie of Faith, is to be rejected; Now the Analogie of Faith is of their own composing, so that Faith and Tryal and all is but Mans work, and *in fine* a very cheat.

But next he must give us the most deadly blow of all; Saying, *We are beyond the reach of a Conviction*; But the Reader may excuse him a little, being now among his Brethren, the *Grecian Hero's*, *Alcibiades* and *Pericles*. But who told him this, that the *Quakers* were *beyond the reach of a Conviction?* Sure not the Scriptures; For there is no such Sentence in them all; Nor the Spirit, for he cannot indure *Divine Inspiration*, the Capital Enemy of the *Presbyterian Priest-hood*; Who then? Imagination: A thing the *Presbyterians* call Faith; The very counterfeit he hath been talking of just now.

Next he tells us, That *Propheſies of future Events may well be brought to the Scripture Test*: Then I beseech him tell me, what Scripture Test could *Noah* his Propheſie of the Flood have been brought to; Or *George*

Wisharts

Wiſharts Propheſie of the Cardinals being killed in ſuch a place, and not in another.

In the cloſe, he ſaith, P*aul was Divinely inſpired, and the Actions were conform to Scripture, conſonant, and warranted by the Promiſe of Chriſt*, &c: But it ſeems he hath forgotten what he ſaid in page 39. Chriſt and his Apoſtles proved their Doctrines by the Scriptures, who were *immediatly inſpired* as well as P*aul*; But any thing will ſerve after ſuch a fatal blow as he hath lately given.

Page 61. He ſaith, The ground of their Arguments, with which they ſtand and fall is this, *The Scriptures are not the Fountain it ſelf, but a Declaration of the Fountain; Therefore they are not to be accounted the principal Original of all Truth and Knowledge, nor yet the adequat Primary Rule of Faith and Manners.*

For *Anſwer*, Let the Reader obſerve, That this is but a *Theſe*; And that our Adverſaries themſelves grant the firſt part of it upon the Reaſon therein adduced: But the Argument to prove the ſecond part, he hath never mentioned, as being too hot for his fingers, Which is this following. *Apol:* page 44.

That

That which is not the Rule of my faith in believing the Scriptures themſelves, is not the *Adequat Primary Rule* of *Faith* and *Manners*.

But the Scriptures are not nor can be the Rule of that Faith by which I believe them, *&c:* Therefore, *&c:* This he hath taken no nottice of: But gives us a long Citation out of R: B: his *Vindication*, page 37. And then tells us the Coherence will be made out *Ad Calendas Græcas*; As if it were the Cuſtom when Men *publiſh Theſes* to ſet down in the Body of them, all the Arguments to prove them. But ſeeing he will have a Coherence, let him take it thus. The Scriptures are not the Fountain, but a Declaration of the Fountain, and when the ſtreams fail, men uſe to recurr to the Fountain; Therefore when the Scriptures cannot reſolve the doubts which ordinarly ariſe among Chriſtians, They ought to recurr to the Fountain. That this hath been the practiſe of the Saints in all ages is manifeſt from the Scripture, I ſhall inſtance one or two with divers before cited. That *David* was a Man of GOD, and knew the Scriptures; I hope mine Adverſary will not deny, and that he had *Abiathar* the Prieſt with him, to help

help him to the right ſence of them (if need were) when he was at *Keilah*; Yet he was neceſſitate to recurr to the Fountain, & enquire of the Lord: Will *Saul come down?* And will the Men of *Keilah* deliver me up unto him, 1 *Sam.* 23. 9, 10, 11, 12. And again at *Ziglag*, when the people were like to ſtone him; Did he not then enquire of the LORD, 1 *Sam.* 30. 8. And I would willingly know what the *Presbyterians* means by ſeeking the LORD in their ſtraits, except it be to ask his Counſel when all other means fail them: Hence all his boaſt evaniſheth.

Next he challengeth his Adverſary, as confounding the principal Rule and Original Ground, together calling it Nonſenſe, ridiculous, and nothing to the purpoſe; But he ſhould have remembred that in page 46. He hath cited *Ephes.* 2. 20. To prove the Scripture to be the Foundation, and all along calls them the Principal Rule: If this be ſenſe, ſo the other.

Sanum Reprenſor debet habere Caput.

In page 64. He comes to begg the Queſtion *in terminis*, and tells us poſitively, *The Scriptures*

Scriptures are the Primary Rule, And concludes. Thus we underſtand the *Primarie Rule*, and while he doth not ſo, he but miſtaketh the Queſtion. This indeed is imperious *Logick*, and more becoming a *Grecian Hero* then a *Presbyterian Prieſt*; But he muſt know that the word *Primary* is out of doors. As it ſignifies Firſt, And before he give it another ſignification, he will need to alter all the *Lexicons* I have yet ſeen; For there was a Rule of Faith before there was a *Book* in the World; And therefore the *Scriptures* cannot be the *Primary Rule*.

Next he comes to his *Acyrologie*, to let us know he hath ſtudied *Rhetorick*; Saying, to call a Perſon a Rule, is a great Inductive of Confuſion. But to call GOD and Chriſt the habits of Grace (as he doth in page 38) is a far more improper ſpeech.

Then he cites R. B's words in anſwer to *J: Brown*, but not fully, and draweth his conſequences from them; the words are " theſe. " For *I* was never ſo abſurd, " as to call GOD ſimply conſidered, or " the Spirit of GOD (*in abſtracto*) (but " as imprinting Truths to be believed " and obeyed in mens hearts, not con-

" contrary

" contrary, but according to Scripture,
" for he cannot contradict himself,) the
" Rule of Christians.

From hence he deduceth two Conclusions, *First*, that the *Quakers* Grand principle, that *Immediate objective Revelations are the primary Rule of their faith, falleth to the ground*; *And that these Imprinted truths are but secondary.* But who seeth not deceit and malice in this consequence? Certainly he must fear his cause, when he takes such weak Pillars to underprop it: For any man of candor may see that *R: B:* intendeth only to prove the truths Imprinted, and not the *Imprinter* to be the Rule; And he confesseth it to be one *Acylogie*, or improper speech. And to conclude the Ruine of his Adversaries cause from one improper speech, is either great folly or great malice, so that his *Antecedent* being rightly understood according to the Authors sense, his consequence together with all he hath deduced from it, is a meer *Non sequitur*.

His other *Consequence* depending upon the first falleth with it: Only he hath been pleased to assert that these *Revelations* are *self evident*, and that to assert otherwayes were impious, And (a little after) to judge that the *GOD of Truth may prove*

the

the lyar, and deceive us! Well then *Patroclus*, it ſeemes there are yet ſuch Revelations by thine own confeſſion, as are ſelf evident, which we may take notice of in due time.

He proceeds, ſaying, *There is very good reaſon to wonder why any Revelation ſhould be more primarie then the Scriptures, both being given by the ſame ſpirit, ſeeing the primarineſs is not the immediateneſs, but the chief binding power, and the prerogative to be the Touch-ſtone of all doctrines?* But who denyeth this prerogative to the Scriptures, of being a Rule to try all Doctrines of Men how holy ſo ever? Have not his Adverſaries granted all this many times? And what then, I hope to believe this propoſition is an Act of Faith no where mentioned in Scripture, neither is it ſelf evident, and therefore needeth a Rule: Yea more, the *ſcriptures* of the *New Teſtament* make mention of a Rule only three times, to wit, 2 *Cor.* 10.15, 16. *Gal.* 6. 16. and *Phil.* 3. 16. And if *Patroclus* with all his prudence and wiſdom comparing Scripture with Scripture, can twiſt and twine a ſenſe out of theſe Scriptures to prove his matter, he may boaſt of it.

Next, he cites 2 *Tim.* 3. 16, 17. in theſe words, *they are able to make the man of GOD*

wiſe unto ſalvation. But whether there be ſuch words there, let the Reader judge; Then he plainly ſheweth us what he intends, and it is the book in the determination of which we ought finally and ſurely to reſt, *&c.*

If this be true, then certainly the Tennor of the *New Covenant* is made void, and they who lived under the Law had a readier acceſs unto GOD, and to know His Mind then they who live under the Goſpel.

And yet the difference is evident, for as the Law was an outward Rule written by *Moſes*, the outward Leader of outward *Iſrael*; ſo *CHRIST* the *Spiritual Leader of Spiritual Iſrael* writteth His *Spiritual Law in the heart.*

I ſhall add one argument thus, That which was a Rule to the *Faith-makers* at *Weſtminſter* in compoſing their form of Faith, and impoſing it upon the Nations, may ſerve to be a Rule to the preſent *Presbyterian Churches.*

But their thinking it in their conſciences to be truth, was their Rule. *Ergo*, &c.

The *Major* I hope they will not deny, and the *Minor* is proven by the Oath taken by every Member at his entrance, which

which was as followeth,

Die Jovis 6: of *July* 1643.

I *A: B: do seriouslie and solemnlie protest in the presence of Almightie GOD, That (in this Assemblie whereof I am a Member) I will not maintain any thing in matters of Doctrine, but what I think in my conscience to be Truth, Or in point of Discipline, but what I shall conceive to conduce most to the Glorie of GOD, and to the Good and Peace of the Church.*

Hence it is evident, That their Conscience was their Rule; But how it was instructed to discern Truth from Errour, whether by the Divine Spirit or by Humane Prudence and Wisdom, let *patroclus* choose; And to help him in his Election, he may consult his Brother, the Author of *Melius Inquirendum*: who a little after he hath told him, that his *ultimate* Rule is a *monster*, Tells him also, *That nothing can possiblie interpose between the Authoritie of GOD and the conscience, and that its dictates are uncontrollable.* Next, he tells us, *That all men have not Divine immediate objective Revelations by which they may examine and discern good from evil:* But the Scripture saith not, that men are condemned for want of Light, But because

Light is come into the World, but Men love darkneſs rather than light. And alſo, *that the Grace of GOD which bringeth Salvation hath appeared to all men.*

He cloſeth up this Number, accuſing R: B: for confounding the principal Rule, and the principal Leader; but theſe are his *Acyrologian* miſtakes, and not his Adverſaries confuſion: For any man not maliciouſly byaſſed, may ſee that he intends no more, but that the Truths Revealed or Imprinted by the Spirit are the Rule, and the Spirit Revealing is the Leader; as he explains himſelf in the beginning of page 39: ſaying, *that Commands as they are Imprinted upon the Soul, that is the Law written in the heart by the Spirit, is more primarie and principallie the Rule than the Scriptures, ſome things written and received only from another.* This he hath maliciouſly paſſed by, together with the Queſtion following, which he could not anſwer, ſo that his confidence or impudence and *metaphiſical formalities* return upon his own head.

In *page* 67: He comes to the interpreter of Scripture, where he intertains us with a diſh of *Rhetorick*, like that of his Brother *Mackquair*, the Arch-ſcold, ſaying; *The Quakers well knowing, That if GOD ſpeaking*

ing in the holy Scriptures be admited judge of the preſent debates between us and them, or if the Holy ſcripture be not eſteemed falſe, ambiguous, and nonſenſical; then their cauſe is loſt.

What more malicious and wicked falſhood could the **Father of Lies** have deviſed againſt a poor innocent People, who from their Hearts abhore any ſuch thought, concerning the Scriptures, as to eſteem them falſe, ambiguous and nonſenſical: Or what end could this **inched Lyar** propoſe to himſelf in aſſerting ſuch a groſs untruth? Except it be to raiſe their Beloved **Reformers the Rabble, to ſtone us!** as two of our Friends lately at *Glaſgow*, had almoſt been ſtoned to Death by them.

But, he ſaith, *The Quakers well knowing, &c.* If this were true, we were as great Hypocrites as the *Faith-makers* at *Weſtminſter*; Who in chap: 23: numb: 4: of their Confeſſion, ſay, *Infidelitie or Differenee of Religion doth not make void the Magiſtrates juſt and legal Authoritie; nor free the People from their due Obedience to him*; While in the mean time they were actually in arms againſt their Lawful King, a Pious as well as *Proteſtant* Prince. Now the *Faith-makers* cite Scripture for the firſt, and the whole party can cite Scripture for the ſecond:

ſo

So let the Reader Judge who it is that renders the Scripture false, ambiguous, or nonelensical. Wherefore he should have said, If the Spirit of GOD, which dictated the Scriptures, be the only true Interpreter of Scripture, then certainly the *Good old Cause* is utterly lost.

As for his phrase, GOD speaking in the Scriptures, and a little after, The Spirit of GOD speaking in the Scriptures, It is an Acyrologie which will need a Commentary: For that GOD spoke the Scriptures to the Prophets and Apostles who wrote them, and that he speaks them now to his Servants in their Hearts at times to their great comfort, is confessed; But that he speaks in the Scripture is a phrase hard to be understood, and in effect, a meer sham to amuse his Reader. As for example, When *Patroclus* stepeth up into his Pulpit, and readeth a sentence of Scripture, which may be somewhat obscure, *As this my Body*, He begines to give us the Interpretation of the *Popish Doctors*, then of the *Lutherian*, and lastly of the *Calviniſt Doctors*; Which last he asserts to be the genuine sense of the Text.

Now I would willingly know, whether it be GOD or Man that speaks here;

The

The *First*, he would be affraid of as *Enthuſiaſtick*. And if the *Second*, What becomes of his Phraſe, GOD ſpeaking in the Scriptures? So the Reader may ſee, That it is a meer humane device to keep up a ſordid Trade (for by this Trade they have their Living, as the *Silver Smiths* had) of making *Merchandiſe of Souls for filthy Lucre ſake.*

But let the Reader know, That we fully owne the *Spirit of GOD*, which gave forth the Scriptures to be his *own Interpreter*, neither do we deny the uſe of *Lawful Means*, ſuch as *Reading*, *Meditating*, *Prayer*, and waiting to know the *Mind of the LORD* in the *Scriptures*, as many of our Friends have publiſhed to the World. So that all which this malicious Man hath ſaid in ſix pages following, falls to the ground, being built upon no one ſolid Argument.

But I ſhal take notice of ſome of them; And *Firſt*, He citeth *George Keith*, Saying, " We may well reject all their Interpre-
" tations of Scripture; ſeeing they pre-
" tend not to the Spirit that gave them
" forth, but declare themſelves Enemies
" to it.

To this he *Anſwereth*, Behold Reader,

The

The groſſeſt of *Popiſh ſhifts* to defend the groſſeſt of *Popiſh Doctrine*. *Anſwer*, If this be true, then *Patroclus* is a great Liar; For in page 32. he ſaith, *The Papiſts have gone too low, reſolving their Faith ultimatly in Men; The Quakers on the other hand attempting to go too high, have contracted a Vertigo*: And in that foregoing page, placeth themſelves in the middle. So that by his own confeſſion he muſt be nearer a kin to the *Papiſts* then we. And in good earneſt, any who are acquainted well with their Principles and Practiſes, will find the Difference nothing but Pretence. For as the *Popiſh Doctors* are the Makers and Rulers of the *Popiſh Faith*; ſo the *Presbyterian Doctors* are the Makers and Rulers of the *Presbyterian Faith*, and no leſs angry perſecuters of all Diſſenters then the *Papiſts*. Only (Bleſſed be the LORD) they have not ſuch power.

As for his ſaying, *We charge all the Reformed Churches as Enemies to the Spirit of GOD, becauſe they try all Doctrines and Practiſes by the Scriptures.*

This contains two Lyes; *Firſt*, That we condemn all the *Reformed Churches*; For R: B: hath cited ſeverals of them who are of his Judgement, and more may be cited in its place. And *Secondly*, The Rea-

ſon

ſon is a groſs Lye; For we alwayes owned, *That all Doctrines and Practiſes of Men were to be tryed by the Scriptures.*

Next he ſaith, Hence we find, *That the ſpirit of the Quakers is Diametrically oppoſite to the ſcriptures, and therefore the ſpirit of lyes and deluſion:* Whence I pray thee Patroelus? Becauſe we reject private *Presbyterian Interpretations*; Which are but Mans wit and work: This Conſequence will be made out (as thou ſayeſt) *ad Kalendas Græcas.* When in a vapouring humour he giveth a *Latine phraſe*, and maketh us *Ghoſts* and *Hobgoblins*; But he hath not yet fallen upon the right ſpell to conjureus, except it be his cutting our Juglar Veins, which he yet wants power, tho not will to do.

His next of any weight is, That from our *denying their Interpretations*; It follows, That our Saviour laboured in vain, when he proved the Reſurrection of the Dead from the *ſcriptures:* But he might have conſidered, that he was GOD as well as Man who ſpoke there, and that his Word was ſufficient.

Secondly, That this *Scripture* was an Argument *ad hominem* to the *Sadducees* who believed *Moſes* Law better then Chriſt.

Thirdly, The Conſequence will be very groſs

groſs, That becauſe Chriſt who had the Spirit above meaſure, proved an Article of Faith by Scripture; Therefore every *Presbyterian Prieſt pedant* may by his own natural and acquired parts, without the Spirit interpret Scripture. But there is at preſent too great contraverſie which ſeems to bring a firie brand in the tail of it, like to deſtroy all that is profitable or beautyful in the Nation (as it hath once already done) and to hazard the lives and eſtates of many well meaning men and good Patriots; *That is, whether there be any difference betwixt the office of a Biſhop and a Presbyter in the Church?* Now if our Author can decide this contraverſie by Scripture to the ſilence of the *Malignants*, as our Saviour did the *Sadduſees*, he will do better ſervice to his *Native Country*, then by all his weak and deceitful wranglings againſt the poor Quakers, who are not compeating with him for the Chair.

But his next conſequence is very odd; Yea ſaith he, *if this Doctrine be true: A man doth not ſin if he worſhip the Crocodale; Ibis, Dog, or Cat, with the old Ægyptians: Yea, a man may believe or do whatſoever cometh in in his Brain*, &c.

Firſt

First, This Doctrine that the Spirit of GOD is the only true interpreter of Scripture can bring no ſuch conſequence along with it; For GOD never taught a man to commit Idolatry, and to ſay that a general prohibation is not binding upon a man becauſe his name is not in it, is rediculous, and no man that I know, ever thought it. But *Secondly*, If his conſequence be true, then no Idolater ſinned before Moſes Law was written; Yea (according to our Author) the *Ægyptians* he ſpeaks of did not ſin: For if they had no *inward Law*, ſure they had no *outward Law*; And (*borreſco referens!*) the old World ſinned not to deſerve the Flood, becauſe they had no written Law, nor any *Presbyterian Prieſt* to interperate *ſcripture*. Next he ſayes *we deny all Commentaries and expoſitions of ſcripture*; He ſhould have added which are meerly mans work without the Spirit of Chriſt, if he will not be accounted a liar.

Then he chargeth *R: B:* for laying *that the Holy Ghoſt is not a diſtinct Perſon of the Trinity*.

I ſhall ſet down *R: B's:* own words that the Reader may ſee how fairly he deals with *R: B*: Thus, " I deſire to

" know

" know of him in what Scripture he finds
" these words, that the Spirit is a dis-
" tinct Person of the Trinity; For I free-
" ly acknowledge according to the Scrip-
" ture, that the Spirit of GOD proceed-
" eth from the Father and the Son, and
" is GOD: And then asketh him whether
" any hath reason to think he truely
" makes the Scripture the Rule of his
" Faith (notwithstanding his pretence)
" when he either will not, or cannot
" find words in it to express the chief
" Articles of his Creed." And now whe-
ther R: B: hath not fully confessed the the Mystrie, and only denyed words of mans invention, let the Reader judge.

Next he challengeth him for taking the words, 1 *John* 2. 27. At the first sound, and without any explication, but he hath no leasure to give us any explication, nor to disprove what he said from the words; But concludes thus, *So that what ever they say, or can say to liberate their doctrine from this most weighty, but just charge they shall only twist contradictions the faster.*

This is a great blow from a *Grecian Gallant*, but hath not the weight of a Feather: For we own the scripture for a Rule, and the best outward Rule in the World,

and

and yet disown the *Presbyterian expositions*, and Commentaries on them, so long as they deny the assistance of the Holy Spirit in the work. And whereas he challengeth us *for not writing Commentaries*; The World is so overloaded with Commentaries of Mans making, each almost contradicting another upon the same text; that we think it best to let *Patroclus* abound in his own sense, till GOD reveal that also unto him, *Phil.* 3. 15.

After this for about a page, he doth nothing but rail and rove at randum, as if *patroclus* like he had the *Trojans* in chase, and were upon execution; And to sum up his Victory, he concludes us *Papists*, because forsooth, we deny the *Scriptures to be the principal Rule of Faith and Manners, and the chief Judge of controversies.*

Answer: First, He hath need here of some of his Metaphisical formalities to distinguish betwixt the Rule or Law, and the Judge, But this we may expect next: The Reason he giveth is, because our Arguments (as he alleageth) conclude with theirs, and instanceth that of *Revel:* 22:18: compared with *Deut:* 4: 2: but hath brought nothing to disprove the inference; Only telling us, to this purpose

may

may *Bellarmine* answer, and the rest of the *Jesuites*: But the difference lyeth here; the *Papists* would thereby set up the *Roman Church* and *unwritten Traditions* to be the *primary rule*; But we the *Teachings of the Spirit of CHRIST*: so that according to *patroclus* own words, in page 32. we differ as far as Heaven and Earth; And he hath chosen a middle place for himself and his Brethren, in which of the *Limbos* he may tell us next: And let this suffice to answer all his Rovings to the end of the Chapter.

Chapter II.
Of *Immediate Revelation.*

HE begins this Chapter with an *hodgpodg* of railing lyes, nonsense and contradictions; such as a man pretending to sense and Learning may be ashamed of, if his desperate malice had not blinded him; Whereby he seeks to bespatter and blaken the *Quakers*, so as

C)

to render them the object of the Magiſtrates ſeverity, or expoſe them to the rage of his beloved **Reformers**, the **Rabble**. For, Firſt, he ſaies, *they have rejected the guidance of the Spirit of GOD*, adding his wonted phraſe, ſpeaking in the Scriptures. But if I ſhall ask him, Doth GOD now-a-dayes ſpeak at all to his Church? He would readily anſwer me, *No*: And within four pages, he labours to prove, *that GOD hath ſpoke his laſt words to his Church*; Which is alſo clear from their Confeſſion of Faith, chap: 1: ſo that as is ſaid before, this phraſe is a meer cheat.

Secondly, he ſaith, *We have moſt impiouſly and ſelf-deceivinglie given up our ſelves to the guidance of ſome Thing, which they call the Spirit of GOD*, as we have heard. Here he falſlie inſinuates, That we give up our ſelves to the guidance of ſome Thing, which is not the Spirit of GOD, which is a groſs untruth: For GOD knoweth, and our Conſciences bear us witneſs, that we own no other Spirit but the ſame, which *Chriſt* promiſed to His followers, *John* 14. 16. *I ſhall pray the Father, and he ſhall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever; even the Spirit of Truth, whom the World cannot receive; becauſe it ſeeth Him*

not

not, neither knoweth Him; But ye know him, for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you; And Vers. 26. *But the Comforter which is the Holy Ghost, Whom the Father will send in my Name, He shall teach you all things*; And 15 Ch: 26. 8. and 16. 17, 18. *The Comforter who will reprove the World of sin, &c.*

This is that Spirit of Truth, To whose Guidance we have given, and do give up our selves; And if he mean any other thing, he is a wicked Slanderer and Callumniator.

Next he adds, And again in contradiction to this, the Soul of CHRIST Extended and Dilated

This is a part of *George Keiths* Book, called, *The way cast up*; To which book he promiseth an Answer: But the Man is able, and can answer for himself against all the *Presbyterian Priests* in *Scotland*.

Then he sayes, But most frequently, they call it the *Light within*, or *simply*, *the Spirit*. And it not this Scripture Language. GOD who commanded Light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts: And was not this the Apostles Message, that GOD is Light, And how frequently is the *Holy Ghost* in scripture called

called ſimply the Spirit without any addition?

But he adds to which *Spirit GOD himſelf ſpeaking in the Scriptures muſt & obey the ſame.* This *blaſphemous Gibberiſh*, being the invention of his own brain deſerves no anſwer; But may well be added to the *Preſbyterian Eloquence* at the next impreſſion. But I paſs by the reſt of his railing, and come to his defence of his Brother *John Browns* Argument, which is this; "If "ſince the Apoſtles fell a ſleep, and the "Cannon of the Scripture was cloſed; All "that have pretended to immediate Re-"velation as a *Primary Rule*, have been "led by a *Spirit of errour*, then it is not "the way of CHRIST.

But the former is true, *&c. Ergo*, &c.

To which *R: B:* hath anſwered, and our Author accepts his anſwer, and changeth the argument thus.

"If ſince the Apoſtles, whoſe names "are mentioned in Scripture fell a ſleep, "and *John* wrote *the Revelation*, all that pre-"tended to this Kynd of *Revelation* have "been led by a ſpirit of error; Then this "is not the way of Chriſt: But the former "is true. *Ergo*, &c.

And now he thinketh there can be no

exception againſt his argument, but that it will certainly do his buſineſs, yet is he like to be miſtaken.

For firſt his argument ſeems to inſinuate that before the Apoſtles fell a ſleep, immediate Revelation was the *Primary Rule*, and if it was ſo, it continues to be ſo yet, by his own former Conceſſions: For GOD hath not changed his Rule; ſo that if he makes his argument to ſpeak to the purpoſe, he muſt ſay thus, all who pretended to this kind of Revelation, as well before as ſince the Apoſtles fell a ſleep were led by a Spirit of error, which I think he would be loath to affirm.

Secondly, He will gain very little tho I grant his argument *in terminis*, for I have as little kindneſs, for pretenders as he hath or can have, and do readily grant that all who pretend to this kynd of Revelations and have them not, are led by a Spirit of error, as well as that all *Presbyterians* who pretend to the Scriptures for their Rule, and do not frame their Faith and manners according to them, are Hipocrites, and are led by a ſpirit of error: So that except his Argument ſay, all who have been led really and truely by the Spirit of Truth (of whom Chriſt promiſed that *he ſhould*

teach

teach them all things, and lead into all truth) were led by a Spirit of error: He doth but beat the air, and fight with his own ſhaddow. For we have had pretenders amongſt us whom we have denyed and rejected. And what he brings concerning the corruptions of men, we deny not: For as men of Corrupt minds may pretend to the Scriptures, ſo they may pretend to the Spirit, but the LORD hath alwayes hitherto given his Church a ſpirit of diſcerning, whereby ſuch pretenders have been detected, rejected, and denyed.

And did not *Zedekiah* the Son of *Chenaanah* pretend to the Spirit, with as much confidence as *Micajah*, 1 *King*: 22. 24. When he ſmote *Micajah*, and ſaid, *Which way went the Spirit of the LORD from me to ſpeak unto thee?* Will it follow from hence, That *Micajah* was led by a ſpirit of errour, becauſe *Zedekiah* pretended to the ſame ſpirit? Or that the *Presbyterians* are led by a ſpirit of errour; Becauſe the *Lutherians*, *Anabaptiſts*, *Independants*, and *Arminians*, pretend to the ſame Rule with them? So as the Scriptures may be wreſted to the condemnation of the Wreſters; Our Author muſt confeſs that he needs a Guide to tell him when he goeth aſtray.

And whereas he citeth ſome called

Quakers, who have erred (whether truely or falſly I know not) I will bring him ten for one among the *Presbyterians*: Yea and the greateſt part of the *Presbyterian Miniſtry* of *Scotland* about the year 1661, foully deſerted the *good old cauſe*, and yet no leſs pretend to the Scriptures for their Rule then they had formerly done.

He falls next to prove, that there is no *Conſanguinity betwixt the Jeſuits argument to Jo: Menzies*, and this of *J: B:* But let the Reader conſider whether both Arguments terminate in the ſame thing; For the *Jeſuites* preſſeth *J: M:* to produce his Grounds and Principles; And our Author in page 78. ſaith his Argument is demonſtrative, except his Adverſary can produce any Inſtance to the contrary; And if this be no *Conſanguinity*, let the Reader judge. And whereas he turneth over the *Jeſuites Argument*, he might well have expected that the *Jeſuite* would and might have ſaid ſo of the *Presbyterians* in *Scotland*, who have fallen into *palpable errours*, and have felt heavy Judgements; Notwithſtanding of all their pretences to the Scriptures for their Rule: For their work of Defamation (falſly by them called *Reformation*) began with the *Sword*, raged

raged with the *Peſtilence*, and *ſickned* with the *famine*; And was at laſt utterly deſtroyed by [illegible] of their own Brood. D: C:

But the Man will ſo farr exceed J: M: That he tells us; *How eaſie had it been to have adduced whole Vollumns*; whereas I believe J: M: was much abler to deall with his *Antagoniſt*, *then our* Frothie Author with all his *Grecian ſophiſtry*.

A little after he taketh all the *Chriſtian* World upon his ſide. Yea, *Chriſtian*, and *Antichriſtian*, *Papiſts*, *Proteſtants*, and *Greeks*, (tho in his Epiſtle to the Reader, he calls the *Lutherians* their capital Enemies) certainly *Patroclus* hath made a notable Mutter againſt the *Quakers*, if all were true, But (I pray him) whence come all theſe diviſions, if ye be all of one mind? I wonder how a Man in his Witts could talk at this rate.

Next after a peece of Froathie Triumph, he ſayes, I anſwer directly to the *Jeſuite* and the *Quaker* his Patron; If we may Believe the ableſt and fierceſt of our Adverſaries; Such as *Bellarmine*, *Contaren*, *Salmeron*, the chief of the Doctrine which we hold in oppoſition to *Popery*, are moſt agreeable to the true ſenſe of Scripture.

Anſwer,

Answer, If I had thought so, as he alledgeth upon these Doctors; *To wit*, That the true sense of the *Scriptures* had been upon the *Presbyterian* side, in their Contraversie with us, I should never have opposed them; For sure I am, GOD cannot contradict Himself. And I would willingly learn from *Patrocles*, upon what ground they could burn *Protestants*, when they believed the true sense of the *Scriptures* to be on their side: Neither can I believe the *Papists* are so gross, as to believe the *first* and practise the *second*: For I suppose the greatest difference betwixt the *Presbyterians* and *Papists*, and all their other Opposers, is about the true sense of the *Scripture*: And therefore he raveth, when he calleth R. B. the *Jesuites* patron; For I am certain that he neither believed you nor the *Jesuites* to have the true sense of the Scriptures; And so his *direct Answer* comes to a *direct nothing to the purpose*.

To R. B. *Third* Answer, *Viz.* That *George Wishart and John Huss had Immediat Revelation*, &c: He replyeth, That R. B. granteth, *They did not pretend to them as the ground of their Faith and Obedience in all Matters of Faith, Worship, and Doctrine.* But certainly they did it in some Matters, for none

none of them could pretend to an outward call to preach the *Proteſtant Doctrine and Worſhip*; And yet they both preached it, and I believe upon a better Ground than a *Presbyterian Call*. But however, our Author does not deny that theſe Men had *Immediat Revelation*; And conſequently his ſerious Truth abſurdly affirmed by *James Durhame*; Viz: *That Chriſt hath ſpoke his laſt words to his Church*, is a fabulous untruth.

Next, he falls again upon *James Naylor*; And becauſe R: B: ſaith, *He repented again*, our Author draws a Noble Conſequence from it, thus, Which *Anſwer* is an evident Confirmation of what we plead for, To wit, *That the Quakers ſpirit is ready to give them the cheat and deceive them*; For I believe J: N: acted but according to his Light, *&c.* This is juſt as much as to ſay, he that ſinneth againſt the Law of GOD and repenteth, he evidently confirmeth that the Law of GOD hath given him the cheat and deceived him, *Abſit Blaſphemia.*

And further, About the beginning of the *Covenant*, your Miniſters had ſworn Canonical Obedience to their Ordinaries; Then they ſwore the Extirpation of them

and

& their Office. And about twenty years after, swore again Canonical Obedience; In all which Three *contrary Oaths*, they pretended the Scripture for their Rule. Was it therefore the Scripture which gave them the cheat and deceived them? No surely. So *James Nayler* sinned against his Light; and the Law of GOD in his heart, and Repented and confessed, he had sinned against his Light, and condemned himself under his hand, (tho this malicious man insinuates the contrary) which I doubt he can say of few of his Brethren, who *perjured themselves in taking the Covenant.*

From what hath been said, he drawes three Consequences, *first*, his serious truth before mentioned, to wit, *That CHRIST hath spoken his last words to his Church*; And to help his Brother out of this Quagmire, he adds, *That is put a close to these writtings which were to be a Rule to the whole Church*; being ashamed to deny, that there were *immediate Divine Revelations* after the Writting of the *Revelation*, being so much testified to in Church History: And themselves having called *Samuel Rutherfoord* a great *Seer*, much upon his Masters secreets. But how will he deal with his Brother *Jurieu*, who in his account of the *Shepherdess* of

Daphyne

Daphine, comes very near to aſſure us of an age at hand, *Wherein we ſhall have Men divinely inſpired, yea, and able to work Miracles*; And in his Book upon the *Revelation*, tells us, *That the firſt Reformation begun by Luther*; (which he calls the *Harveſt*) *was carried on by the Miniſtry of Men*; But the ſecond which is yet to come, he calls the *Vintage*, and ſaith, *It will be by the Inſpiration of GOD*; And in his Characters of the Kingdom of CHRIST, he gives for one of them, *That there ſhall be a plentifull pouring out of the Spirit, whereof* (he ſaith) *That which the Apoſtles received at Jeruſalem was but a Type.*

I could inſtance many others, ſome who have had it, and others who have foretold of it; But this being a Modern Writer, a *Calviniſt*, and a Sufferer, well eſteemed of by all *proteſtants*, I thought might ſuffice to ſhew, that all the *Calviniſts* believe not this ſerious Truth, as he calls it.

His two following Conſequences deduced from his Argument formerly anſwered and Refuted, are of no force; For (bleſſed be the LORD) we can inſtance Thouſands who neither have fallen into palpable Errors, nor open Blaſphemy; Nor have marks of GOD's heavy Judgements, but

but have lived and died in Favour with GOD and Good Men, tho perſecuted by the *Presbyterians* and *Independents* their Brethren; By whoſe unjuſt Judgement ſome of them have been put to cruel death.

His third Conſequence being a meer windie bauble, deſerves no anſwer.

His ſecond Argument is, "*Moſes and the Prophets, CHRIST and the Apoſtles, and all the Holy Men that were Inſpired by GOD to Compile a Rule of Faith and Life*, &c Could by infallible Evidence and infallible Proofs, even to the Conviction and ſelf Condemnation of the greateſt Oppoſers, demonſtrat that they were ſent of GOD, But nothing of this kind the *Quakers* can do; yea they are ſo far from it, that they can bring no more Evidence or Credentialls for their Rule of Faith or pretended Revelation, then the moſt wicked *Enthuſiaſts*: As for example *John of Layden*, and his Followers, &c.

To this Argument he ſets down R. B's. Anſwer, but ſlily omitteth what followeth, which is, And therefore moſt weak is his Reaſoning in page 461, That ſuch Revelations cannot be more ſure then the Scriptures, which are the *Objective Revela-*

tions

tions of the Apoſtles written down, ſince the certainty of theſe Writtings depends upon the certainty of theſe *Revelations* by which they were written: And if any caſe that Maxim of the Schools hold, it muſt in this; *Propter quod unum quodque eſt tale, illud ipſum eſt magis tale.* And this may ſerve to anſwer his talk of a *chief binding power*, and *prerogative* to be the *Touchſtone* of all *Doctrines*: For if they be ſo, it is becauſe they were *Divinely inſpired*; And therefore *Divine Inſpirations* muſt be much more ſo. But let us conſider his Argument.

Firſt, He ſaith, 'The Prophets and A-'poſtles, (for *Chriſt* wrote no Scripture) 'could by infallible Evidence and proofs, 'even to the conviction and ſelf-condem-'nation of the greateſt Oppoſers demon-'ſtrate, that they were ſent of GOD; but 'whence came it then that their greateſt 'Oppoſers did not receive their Teſtimo-'ny? Why did they perſecut them even 'to death? As their Succeſſors the *Preſby-'terians* and their Brethren the *Independents* 'have done to ſome of us? Was it not 'becauſe they were not convinced that 'they were ſent of GOD? Or was it be-'cauſe they maliciouſlie hardened their

" hearts

'hearts, and would not believe it? The 'ſame is the caſe with our Author, and 'his Brethren at this day. But perhaps he expecteth miracles for Proofs and Evidences; And in this followeth the footſteps of his predeceſſors the *Papiſts*, who dealt ſo by the firſt *Reformers*: And the ſame Anſwer the firſt *Reformers* gave to the *papiſts* may ſerve him: For as they ſaid, *They needed not Miracles becauſe they preached not a New Goſpel*: So we pretend not *Revelations* of *New Things*, But a New *Revelation* of the Good old things: And again what can he pretend to that we want? He hath produced nothing: Only in page 81, He ſaith on the other hand, *It is beyond denyall, that we have the Scriptures*; And is it not as true that we have them? But the Queſtion is, Who hath the true ſenſe of them? The *Papiſts* ſay, *They are the only true Infallible* Propounders: J: B: and our Author ſay, *Chriſtian prudence and Wiſdom, comparing the Text with the Text*; *And we ſay*, The Holy Spirit, who gave them forth, is the only Right Interpreter. *Et ad hucſub judice lis eſt.*

But he falls upon *R: Barkclay*, for ſaying, *That others pretending to be led by the Scriptures as their Rule, as much as J: B: have*

been

been deceived. To which he anſwers, "If "the Scriptures, through the corruption "of men may be wreſted and abuſed to "the patrocinie of errours and corrupt "practiſes; Then altho men clearly "underſtand and firmly believe them, "and ſquare their Life exactly according "to them: Yet they are no more able to "be a Rule to them, then theſe Reve-"lations can be which *John* of *Leyden* "*held.*

This he ſaith is the *firſt* propoſition into which R: B's. Argument reſolveth; And the *ſecond* is no better then this, *Viz:* "He that will not admit of ſuch Reve-"lations which cannot be diſtinguiſh-"ed from theſe that led their followers "into the moſt blaſphemous opinions and "moſt wicked practiſes immaginable; "He who will not admit of them for his "Principal Rule, but preferreth unto "them the Scriptures, *&c:* Provideth "an Argument for *Atheiſts* and *Scep-"ticks.*

Anſwer, Could the Devil himſelf in his moſt cunning ſubtile transformings, have more deceitfully and diſſingenuouſly repreſented this ſober and diſcreet Anſwer of R: B: But it ſeems the man is paſt all ſhame

shame: For *first*, He insinuats that R: B: saith, *That men firmly believing and clearly understanding the Scriptures, and squaring their practise exactly conform to them, may err as did* John *of* Leyden. Secondly, *That he owns the Revelations which* John *of* Leyden *pretended to, to be a Rule.* And thirdly, *That he denyeth the Scriptures to be a Rule.* All which three are groſs and notorious Lyes, unworthy of a man of any Candor or Honeſty.

His *ſecond* Propoſition is drawn from theſe words of R: B: And indeed this is a fine Argument he hath produced for *Scepticks* and *Atheiſts*, for it renders all Faith, even that of the *Patriarchs* uncertain: For ſince their ground and warrand for writing the Scripture was in his own account, *Inward, Immediat, and extraordinary Revelation:* And if ſuch be, as he affirms, uncertain, then the Truth of the Scriptures which depends upon ſuch, muſt neceſſarly be uncertain. Now the man certainly knew that R: B: was pleading for none other Revelation, but *Divine, Inward*, and *Immediat Revelations:* But being ſtraitned by this Anſwer, he betakes himſelf to the covers of Deceit, and the refuge of Lyes for in his Reply inſtead of the *Revelation* of the

the Spirit of GOD (which he knew his Adversary meant) he puts in the Revelations of *John* of *Leyden*; Which impudent treachery is obvious to any Reader at first view.

Hence he might conclude, That because *Micajah* wrought no Miracles to prove his propheſie more then the Prieſts of *Achab* did, therefore he was not to be believed: And becauſe *John Huſs*, *George Wiſhart*, and *Samuel Rutherfoord*, wrought no Miracles; Therefore they were no more to be truſted then *John of Leyden*; For Miracles only excepted, I know no proofs he can lay claim to, but we can do the ſame.

But the beſt is, That in page 80, he would father theſe Deductions upon his Adverſary; Saying, *And now Reader, ſpeak thy mind in good earneſt; Thinkeſt thou that this man was in his Witt, or to be numbred among Rationals, when he made theſe Deductions*, &c. Truly he is a very weak Reader, That ſeeth not this mans affronted deceit; And ſeeing the Deductions are intirely his own and none of R: B's: He muſt (by his own Confeſſion) be numbred among Brutes: And whereas he ſaith, That J: B: never called the Revelations

of

of the Prophets uncertain; He ſhould have told what hath made Divine Revelation uncertain now, which he cannot; Or have proven that it is altoghther ceaſed, which he dare not undertake, tho it be an Article of his Faith. And thus by denying the certainty of Divine Revelations (for R: B: pleads for none elſe) let the Reader judge if he have not laboured to confirm his Brothers Atgument for *Atheiſts* and *Seepticks*.

In *page* 81. He thinks to put an end to the contraverſie by ſome poſitions, whereof the firſt is to this purpoſe; *We cannot know whether they have any Revelation at all, They may be lyeing unto us: For any thing we know, we have only their naked words for it; whereas on the other hand, it is beyond denyal that we have the Scriptures.*

This had been very ſuitable language for their predeceſſors, The *Jews* when they ſtoned the *Proto-Martyr Stephen*, *Acts* 7. 56. When he ſaid, *Behold I ſee the Heavens opened, and the Son of Man ſtanding on the Right Hand of GOD*; And for *Joaſh* the King, when he cauſed *Zachariah* to be ſtoned to Death, and for *Achab* to *Micajah*, and many other of the Prophets who wrought no Miracles to prove their Miſſi-

on;

miſſion; But *Chriſts ſheep hear his voice, and know it from the voice of a ſtranger, whom they will not follow*; Tho ravenous Wolves in Sheeps cloathing, neither can nor will believe it to be his voice: And whereas he ſaith, *it is beyond denyal that we have the Scriptures*; Is it not beyond denyal, that we have them alſo? Or do any who profeſs Chriſtianity want them? Or what Advantage have they by them, which others have not; Except it be to make a ſordid Tarde of ſelling their Interpretations of them. So that we dare attempt the Retortion very eaſily, thus the *Lutherians*, *Independants*, *Baptiſts*, *Socinians*, and *Arminians*, &c: had the Scriptures as well as the *Presbyterians* have them; So that the Controverſy is only, Who have the true ſenſe of them, each party pretending to it. And now I ask him, what infallible Signs, Evidences, and Proofs can he give, to the conviction and ſelf condemnation of the greateſt Oppoſers (as he words it) to demonſtrate that the *Presbyterians* and none elſe have the true ſenſe of the Scriptures? Which till he do, the retortion ſtands good.

But to take his words as they lye, I can compare them to nothing better then to

the words of the Phariſees, Joh: 9. 29. *We know that GOD ſpake by Moſes, as for this fellow, we know not from whence he is.*

His ſecond is, *It being given, that they have Revelations of ſome kind; From whence are they? From Heaven? Their own fancy, or from hell?*

Anſwer, We plead for no Revelations, but ſuch as are Divine; And therefore, as his Queſtion is blaſphemous, ſo it is no leſs impertinent then to ſay; It being given that *Patroclus* is a Man, from whence is he? Whether the ſon of a Man, or a horſe, or of a mad Dogg? But he proves they are not from Heaven, becauſe they are common to all men; Yet, *Bonum quo communius eo melius, Chriſt hath enlightned every man coming into the World, and GOD is juſt*, He never puniſhed a man for breach of a Law, which he never made known to him.

Thirdly he ſaith, *If they have Divine Revelations, we know not for what end they are given; Whether to be a principal Rule or not, whether by their own corruptions they do not wreſt and miſunderſtand them; Or if they walk according to them? Nothing of which can be ſaid of the Scriptures.*

Anſwer firſt, For what end they are given,

John

Joh. 14. 26. *To teach you all things.* And 16. 13. *He will guide you into all Truth:* And that they are the *principal Rule*, is ſufficiently proved before. The *ſecond* part is an impudent ſelf contradiction, where he ſaith, *That wreſting or miſunderſtanding, through corruption cannot be ſaid of the Scriptures:* Whereas he hath frequently covered himſelf before, with ſaying, in the *very* foregoing page next ſave one, *That the Scriptures, through mans corruption are ſubject to abuſe*, never man denyed; Thus goeth he backward and foreward. And *Thirdly*, He ſaith, *They know not if we walk according to them:* But we well know, that they walk not according to the Scriptures; And it's ſtrange with what impudency the man can obtrude ſuch ſayings upon the World. He would inſinuate in page 79. That they ſquared their practice exactly according to the Scriptures, and here he would have us walk according to *Divine Revelation:* Whereas they have told the World in their *Larger Catechiſm*; *That no man is able to keep GOD's Commands by any Grace received in this Life.* Then he giveth us the reaſon of his Ignorance thus; *For we can hear nothing nor ſee nothing*, &c: Who can help his ſpiritual deafneſs and blind-

neſs? None but the *Spiritual Phyſitian* of Souls whom he is rejecting.

In page 82. He cometh to the Judge of contraverſy; where he laboureth to prove two things, *Viz: That the Spirit of God cannot be a Judge of Contraverſy; And that the Scriptures are apt to be a Judge of Contraverſy;* Which he dares not to ſay abſolutely, but for removal of differences about things contained in them.

The Reaſon he gives is, *Becauſe two different parties may both of them adduce Revelations to prove contradictory aſſertions; And that the one of them cannot evince his Revelations to be from GOD, more then the other.* This is the ſubſtance of what he ſaith againſt the Spirit, and for the Scriptures he ſaith thus: Now, this Argument can in no wayes be retorted on the Scriptures; For tho there hath been, through the corruption of men, wreſting of Scripture in any Contraverſy; And that even among theſe who aſſert the Scripture to be the *Principal Rule of Faith and Manners*; Yet, who can ſay, That this is through default of the Scriptures; ſeing our Adverſarys cannot deny, but that they ſpeak both ſenſe and Truth, &c: And a little after, ſo that there

there ſhall follow a mutual agreement betwixt the two diſſenting parties, &c.

Firſt, Let the Reader obſerve his ſelf-contradiction, Saying, *The Scriptures may be wreſted by the corruption of men*; And yet in page 81. He ſaith, *Nothing of this can be ſaid of the Scriptures.*

Secondly, That *he confeſſeth* (becauſe he cannot deny it) *that there have been* (and yet are) *wreſting of Scriptures, and many Controverſies even among ſuch as aſſert the Scriptures to be the principal Rule of Faith and Manners*; And therefore it is evident, that his concluſion falls, *Viz:* ſo that there ſhall follow a mutual agreement betwixt the two diſſenting parties; For this agreement hath neither followed, nor is like to follow by all his endeavours.

And *Thirdly*, The Scriptures can never give a ſentence, being but a Law; And every Law needs a Judge to determine. But the matter is in plain terms, we muſt admit the General Aſſembly to be Judge, which will determine and convince, neither by the Spirit, nor by Scripture, nor by Reaſon; But by **Force** and **Furie, Axes, Halters, Fire** and **Sword.**

Fourthly, If this had been true, all the difference among *Proteſtants* would have

come to a mutual agreement before now, or elſe he muſt ſay, They are all corrupt men, exc ept the *Presbyterians.*

As for what he ſaith of the *Ranters* (who learned from you to make GOD Author of all their wicked actions) their fruits make them manifeſt, as your fruits do you, notwithſtanding of both your Pretences.

In page 83. He ſaith, *We have heard their Retortions*, Let us now hear their direct Anſwer; That their fruits declare them to have the Spirit of GOD; For which forſooth, they bring Scripture Proof from *Matthew*, 7. 15. 16. Where *fruits* are made the *Teſt* for trying whether one be a *true* or *falſe prophet. Thus he*, And then falls a railing with great bitterneſs, lies and falſe accuſations, which is always his laſt Refuge when he is ſtraitned. But let the Reader obſerve, *Firſt*, That he mocks at Scripture proof (tho he dare not deny it) adding a *Forſooth* to it, as if none had right to the Scripture but *Presbyterian Prieſts.*

Secondly, That for Fruits, he enumerats four groſs and abominable Untruths, wherewith he chargeth us. To witt, That we deny the *Holy Trinity*, *the Perſon of*

our

our Lord JESUS CHRIST, *The Reſurrection of the Body, and that we aſſert the Souls of Men, yea, and devils too, to be GOD Almighty*; Of all which he ſaith, he will prove the *Quakers* to be undenyably guilty, before he end *his Treatiſe.*

This needs no Anſwer, But to ſay. *The Lord rebuke this lying ſpirit which hath gone forth in the mouth of this lying falſe Accuſer:* For the LORD GOD whom we ſerve, knoweth our Innocency in this matter; and will in his due time vindicat his people from theſe malicious Callumniators.

But *Thirdly*, The Man might have conſidered that theſe are points of Faith and not of Works, and that our Saviour ſpoke here of Works, and not Faith only. The moſt wicked Man in the Nation may believe all the *Weſtminſter Creed* as well as *Patroclus* doth, and yet receive the Sentence in verſe 23. of the ſame Chapter, *Depart from me ye workers of iniquity.* And therefore, tho he ſhould add another *Forſooth* to it, I will betake me to the Fruits mentioned in Scripture, and then let the World (which he ſayes is not ignorant) judge between them and us. *Galat*: 5. 20. Where theſe are reckoned for *Fruits of the Fleſh, Variance*, E-

mulation

mulations, Wrath, Strife, Seditions, Envyings, Murthers. &c. Which whither they have been peculiar to that *Tribe*, let the Nation judge. On the other hand the *Fruits* of the Spirit are *Love, Peace, Joy, Long-ſuffering, Gentleneſs, Faith, Meekneſs, Temperance*, &c. And whether the people, in deriſion called *Quakers*, be found in the Exerciſe of ſuch Fruits, let ſuch as are acquainted with their converſations, bear Witneſs for or againſt them. And I may ſay without reflection, if to devour and deſtroy, be the fruits of *Abbadon* and *Apollyon*, Theſe are the only Spirits, the *Presbyterian* Fruits can lay claim to; which to enumerat, were to writ a hiſtory, but the late Advocat *George Mackenzie* hath given an Epitome of them, to which I refer the Reader:

In page 84. He chargeth R. B. with three lies; Citing his *Vindication*; But how groundleſsly, will be evident to any who will be at the pains to examine R. B's. words, to which for brevity I refer the Reader. Only this, the firſt is as really *John Browns*, as his two Hypothetick propoſitions are his own, in page 79. To which R. B. anſwers, what a horrible lie is this? The Second is no lie, For in *chap:*

3 *Num*: 2. Of the *Weſtminerr Confeſſion* we have theſe words. *Altho GOD knows whatſoever may or can come to paſs upon all ſuppoſed Conditions, yet he hath not decreed any thing, becauſe he foreſaw it as future, or as, that it would come to paſs upon ſuch conditions.*

And in the very next words, they add *By the Decree of GOD for the Manifeſtation of His Glory, ſome men and Angels are predeſtinated unto everlaſting Life, and others fore-ordained unto everlaſting death.* Let him interpret this with the next, for if it bear not all that R. B. ſaith, it is no better then the Anſwers of the *Delphick Oracle*. So that which he calls a palpable and horrid Lie, will be found to be a manifeſt Truth to any that can read the *Confeſſion* above cited.

His *third* is that I. B. *makes a preaching to the devil*, to deny which, is impudence with a Witneſs: And as for railing in pulpit and print, it is too well known to the Nation to ſeek to cover it. Whereof *Brown* and *Mackquare* are two famous inſtances, neither is our Author a Novice in that ignoble art, wherein leſt he ſhould come ſhort of his Brethren, he giveth us a ſhort parralel between the old *Libertine Anabaptiſts*

Anabaptists, and the new, who are known by the name of *Quakers*.

This *is an old blast from a new horn*, a work already done by *George Meldrum*, when he was Preacher at *Aberdeen*, and fully answered by *George Keith* without any reply, To which I might remit my Reader, but because it is not yet printed I shall touch at some of them, and it is to be suspected not without cause, that the hand of *Joab* is in all this.

His *first* is, That these men said, *The Word of GOD was a certain heavenlie thing distinct from the Scriptures*: Adding, the same is the downright Doctrine of the *Quakers*.

Answer, What was their Doctrine I know not, for I see little ground to believe their Adversaries did not belie them more then that our Adversaries do not belie us now: which they are not ashamed to do in the face of the Sun, but our Doctrine is well known to be, That *Christ is the Word of GOD*, according to the Scriptures and that the *Scriptures, are the words of GOD*.

His *second is about immediat Revelation*, But our Doctrine on this head is sufficiently cleared in the foregoing Treatise.

His *third is*, *That the expres words and*

phrases

phraſes of the Scripture is to be adhered to without anie expoſition, interpretation, or deduction: That is a groſs Callumny may be ſeen in page 67. of his own Book, where he accuſeth *George Keith of poperie* for rejecting their interpretations without the Spirit; And it is manifeſt we have always contended that the Spirit was the only true Interpretet of hard Scriptures, where they were heard to be underſtood, and that the expreſs Words were to be adhered to, where plain.

His *Fourth* is, that we aſſert, *that nothing recorded in the old Teſtament is binding and incumbent to us, but as it is ratified by CHRIST in the new, and hath precept or authority from it*: For which he citeth R: B's: vindication, *page* 178. *Num*: 5. And to ſhow the Reader his baſe ingenuity; I ſhall tranſcribe R: B's words, which are theſe: "He ſeeks malicioufly to infert "that I deny all authority of the *Old Teſtament*, which is a horid callumny: But "ſince there are many things therein, "which himſelf will acknowledge, are "not binding upon us now; What ſhall "be the Rule whereby we ſhall judge "what we are now tyed to, and what "not: *&c.*

If

If this be to deny the obligation of the *Old Teſtament*, or to ſay it is abrogat, let the Reader judge: But it ſeems our Author thinketh the *Ninth Commandement* to be abrogated, elſe he would not ſo confidently bear falſe witneſs againſt his Neighbour.

His fifth inſtance of Original ſin, he referreth to his third Chapter, and ſo ſhall I.

His ſixth is, *That Chriſt made no ſatisfaction for ſins*, and compared them who taught the contrary to the *Scribes* and *Phariſees* to aſſert which of the people called *Quakers* is groſs and deteſtable injuſtice, forgerie and malice: But to cover this, he addeth another no leſs falſe as to us, that it is damnable and dangerous Doctrine to aſſert *that we are juſtified by the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt*, &c. Which he promiſeth to prove in his fifth Chapter, but will never be able to prove any thing like theſe two calumnies againſt us, as I hope ſhall be ſeen in its place.

His *Seventh* is, that they *aſſerted the poſſibility of fulfilling the Law*: If he had ſaid that we *aſſert a poſſibility of keeping the Commandments of GOD* (not of our ſelves, but) *through the Grace of GOD*. We own this charge

charge, and think it no error, but a ſound and great Truth. As for the word *Law* we are not under the Law but under Grace; And here according to his cuſtom, he inſerts a groſs lie upon R. B: ſaying, *for the denyal of which R: B: promiſed continually to rail upon all the Reformed.* It ſeems the man hath dreamed this: For I am certain he can never tell where or to whom he promiſed any ſuch thing; What he undertakes in his fourth Chapter, we ſh.ll ſee how he proves it.

His *eight* inſtance is, *that they denyed the perſeverance of the Saints.*

In this, he alſo miſrepreſents us, for we have alwayes aſſerted, that there is a ſtate of *Confirmation in Grace, attainable by all, and attained by in any, which cannot be fallen from: And that ſome have made ſhipwraek of Faith and a good conſcience cannot be denyed.*

His *Ninth* inſtance is, their *denying of the Reſurrection of the ſame body*, and referrs to the fifth Chapter of his book: But whatever the Apoſtle *Paul* ſaith in 1 *Corinth*: 15. We do willingly believe and acknowledge, and if this Man hath any thing more revealed unto him, concerning the Reſurrection, then what *Paul* tells us, he will do well to publiſh it. His

His *Tenth* is, that they *deny the Sacred Trinity*, and the *Divinity of Christ*, which he alſo deceitfully chargeth upon us, referring to his 4*th* Chapter, wherein I hope his deceit ſhall be detected. The Juſt GOD who ſearcheth our hearts, and knoweth the contrary will certainly reward this *falſe accuſer*, according to his work, except he repent.

His *Eleventh* inſtance is, That they aſſerted. *The Miniſters of the Goſpel ought not to be tyed to the explaining of the ſcriptures, that all in the Church ought to ſpeak by turns*, &c. *And that the Miniſters ought to have no certain Stepend.*

This inſtance hath three accuſations; To the firſt, we ſay, *If any man ſpeak let him ſpeak as the Oracles of GOD, and according to the Grace given him, ſo let him Miniſter*: Not that we are againſt the explaining of ſcripture by a Miniſter, as he is led thereto by the *Spirit of Chriſt*, But that in his Preaching he ſhould be tyed thereto only, we ſee no reaſon for it, for either this tye upon him is by *Divine* or *Humane authority*: If by *Divine authority*, let our author produce it, and it ſhall be no more diſputed; And if by *humane authority* (as indeed the whole *Presbyterian* Miniſtry

Miniſtry is) Then this tye is not binding upon any true Goſpel Miniſter; But he may *teach, exhort, admoniſh* as GOD giveth him utterance, not contrary, but according to the Scriptures, without taking a Text, and telling his own dark imaginations from it.

His *Second* acculation is, *that all in the Church ought to ſpeak by turns*, This is another groſs lie, for we never ſaid that all in the Church ought to ſpeak, but we are not aſhamed with *Paul* to ſay, 1 *Corinth:* 14. 13. *For yee may all Propheſie one by one*, (yet not all in the Church) for as the ſame Apoſtle ſayeth, *No man can ſay that Jeſus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghoſt*.

His *Third* acculation is, *That the Miniſters ought not to have certain Stipend*: It is ſtrange that this malicious adverſary can repreſent in its true and genuin collours, but twines and twiſts like a crooked Serpent, to faſten ſome reproach upon innocent men. Can there be a more certain Stepend then the *free benevolence of true Chriſtians* to a *true Chriſtian Miniſter*; Or do any of our Miniſters complain of want, or come to begg of the *Presbyterians*? but he ſhould have ſaid we were againſt a forced mantainance by *Horning, poinding, Impriſonment, adjudication*

Adjudication of Lands, by which tools ye exact *Temporals* from such as will have none of these things ye call *Spirituals*: And herein we have many *Martyrs*, and good *Protestants* for us, as ye cannot but know; altho this degenerate and self seeking generation have forsaken their paths, and have followed the way of *Balaam*, *who loved the wages of unrighteousness.*

His twelfth Instance is, *They denyed that a Christian ought to be a* Magistrate *or in any case make Warr, to take or administer Oaths*; Or *trouble any man, upon the account of his Religion*, Or *to probibite any kind of Religion.*

Here are five bold accusations again; whether they were doctrines of these *Anabaptists*, I know not, nor am I concerned: I think it is very unlike that such fighters as they were said to be, would deny all Warrs to be Lawful.

But to the *first* I Answer, It is a horrid and shameless Lie; And for instance, some of us have been Magistrates particularly *Gavine Lawrie* in the Province of *East-New-Jarsey* in *America*, to the great satisfaction of all the Inhabitants: In this place a certain *Presbiterian* Preacher came to him, and complained of his Hearers, *That contrary*

contrary to their Contract made with him, they refuſed to pay him for Preaching: Whereupon both parties being heard, *He decerned, that during the time contained in the Contract, they ſhould pay him*; Which was a great diſappointment to the Brethren. As for the unlawfulneſs of *Oaths* and *Warrs* under the Goſpel. We owne it, and have abundantly proven it in many Treatiſes, yet unanſwered: And as for *Libertie of Conſcience*, it wont to be the great cry of the *Presbiterians*, when they were under perſecution themſelves; But being now the *Church triumphant* in *Scotland*, *they may perhaps change their tune*: But for this he may conſult his Brother, the Author of *Melius Inquirendum*. And if it be the duty of the Magiſtrate any kind of Religion to prohibite, then ſure *Reformation* of *Religion* does not belong to the Commonality, as *John Knox* ſaith; Yea, if this had been only the Office of the Magiſtrate, *Presbytrie* had never reigned in *Britan*. But to take theſe accuſations in the Complex, and compare them with theſe of *Julian* the *Apoſtat*, againſt the *Primitive Chriſtians*; And the Reader will find a greater agreement then betwixt us and the *Anabaptiſts*. *Philip Melanchton*, in his *Chronicon Carionis* page

278. *Scripſit & ipſe libros contra Chriſtianos, &c:* Thus Engliſhed, " He alſo wrote " Books againſt the Chriſtians, or the " doctrine of the Church; In which Books, " He chiefly debateth the forbiding of " Revenges: He ſaith, They take away " *Magiſtracie, Judicial Sentences, Puniſhments,* " *Lawful Warrs,* And infinitly confirm " *Robberies:* And *Laſtly,* That this Doc- " trine fighteth with common ſenſe, and " taketh away the Nerves of humane So- " ciety. Behold Reader the Doctrine of our Author.

His thirteenth and laſt Inſtance is, concerning the *Sacraments* (ſo called) wherein I think the man hath not been well in his Witts, when he ranked us with *Anabaptiſts:* But becauſe theſe things are to be handled elſewhere, I ſhall here wave them.

Now Reader, I deſire thou may conſider, That there is not one of the thirteen, wherein he hath not either groſly belyed or deceitfully miſrepreſented us; And in ſome things, theſe *Anabaptiſts*, as in his twelfth Inſtance (for which he hath cited no Book) he alledgeth they denyed the *Lawfulneſs of all Warrs*; Wheras *Sleidans Commentaries lib:* 5. *Mieneer* incited the *Boors* of *Germanie* to undertake the *Holy*

Warr

Warr (as he called it) *againſt the Princes*; Telling them, *That he was commanded of GOD to cut off all wicked perſons and Princes.* And how well this agrees with the *Presbyterian* practiſes and Doctrines, is but too nottour. Read the *Hynd let looſe*, and *Zions Plea*, Fol: 262. *Strick the Baſilick Veine.* Nothing but this will cure the Pleuriſee of our State.

And to ſay, That they were for *Libertie of Conſcience*, is no leſs inconſiſtent with their Practiſes, for they laboured to propagate their Religion by the Sword; And ſo did our *Presbiterians*: Yea, and put themſelves under a neceſſity ſo to do by a ſolemn Oath? Only the difference betwixt *Munzer* and the *Presbiterians* was this. *Ille crucem ſceleris pretium tulit hi diadema.* There was another Doctrine common to them, both *Anabaptiſts* and *Presbiterians*, *Viz:* **All is Ours**; Which Text they expounded thus; *That all the wealth of the World belonged properlie to the Saints, and whatſoever other men poſſeſſed was but by uſurpation*: Agreeable to this was the practiſe of our *Presbiterians*, who after they had got poſſeſſion of the *Kings Revenue*, the *Biſhops Rents*, the *Papiſts Eſtates*, and theſe they called *Malignants*, and were ſqueez-

ng the Nation with *insupportable Cesses* and *Excise:* They at last deviled a trick how the *Israelite* might robe the *Ægyptian*, by forcing every man, who was not as Zealous as the fervency of the times required, *To lend them his money upon the publick Faith* (commonly called *the Blind Bonds*) which Faith certainly will never justifie them, *For the wicked borrweth and payeth not again.* Yet in all this the Judgement of GOD was visible, for the most part of them who gote the spoil of their Native Country, left their Heirs in a worse condition then they might have done, if they had never meddled.

By all this it is evident, That the Mans malice hath blindfolded him, and that all his Lies and Perversions cannot help his bad cause: But their enmity and hatred to Truth drives them on, tho they might remember, that he who hates his Brother is a murtherer, and no murtherer hath Eternal Life abiding in him. Had it not been as easie for him to have said, The *Lollards taught several Doctrines which the Quakers hold, and which we have neglected, tho we desire to be accounted their Successors.* Such as,

First,

First, It is not lawful to Fight for the *Faith.*

Secondlie, That *Tiths ought not to be paid to Eccleſiaſtical Perſons.*

Thirdlie, That *every faithful Man and Woman is a Prieſt.*

Fourthly, That *in no caſe it is lawful to Swear.*

Fifthly, That *true Chriſtians receive the Body of Chriſt every day* &c. All theſe we ſhould have acknowledged, tho this backſliding and *degenerat Tribe* have denied them.

Next, we come to his third Argument, againſt *Divine immediat Revelation*; *viz.* "If "the Spirit or the Light within every "Man, were the Supream and Principal "Rule, then theſe who perſecuted to Death "the Apoſtles and Saints of God, did not "Sin in ſo doing; but I am ſure the lat-"ter is falſe: *Ergo* the former: To prove the Conſequence of the *Major*, he citeth *Paul* and *John* 16. 2. alledging, "That "*Paul* walked according to his Light, and "that his Light taught him, that accord-"ing to all he had for Light, he ought to "do many things againſt the Profeſſors "and Servants of Jeſus Chriſt.

Anſwer, Let the Reader obſerve, *First*, His conſtant diſingenuity, whereof he hath

been ſo often found guilty: For he ſhould have ſaid, If the Teachings of the Spirit of Chriſt and His Light, wherewith He hath enlightned every Man, be the principal Rule, &c. Which would have urged upon Blaſphemy, if the reſt of his Argument had been added to it: Which notwithſtanding is the true ſtate of the Controverſy. *Secondly*, Obſerve how blind the Man is, for he hath fallen in the Ditch he digged for us; *Paul* (ſaith he) according to all that he had for Light, *Ought to do many things againſt the Servants of Jeſus*, &c. But *Paul* had the Scriptures (and was learned in the knowledge of them) for Light: *Ergo*, according to our Author, *Paul* according to the Light of the Scriptures ought to perſecute the Saints.

Thirdly, By this Argument the Old World, yea all who lived before *Moſes* wrote, had no Sin, becauſe no Scripture, and the Light of Chriſt, and Teachings of the Spirit, was no ſufficient Rule to them: All the *Mahumitans* and *Pagans* at this day have no Rule, therefore no Sin. Theſe are the wild Conſequences of this Argument.

Fourthly, His inſtancing *Paul* is very impertinent; For *Paul* had the Scriptures, and

and was one of them who thought they had *Eternal Life* in the Scriptures, and no doubt he thought them *a Rule for his perſecuting the Saints*: For he ſaid he had lived *blemleſly according to the Law:* And therefore it could be no other thing but the Light of Chriſt, and the teachings of his Spirit, which brought *Paul* to a better Underſtanding. And whereas he ſaith in his next Argument, *That Paul never counteracted, his Light, was always of the ſame Judgement, and therefore never had a true Light till the day of his Converſion.* This clearly contradicts the Scriptures, and the experience of all Ages: *John* 12 *Chap.* 36. *While ye have Light believe in the Light, that ye may be the children of the Light*: Hence it is clear, Men have *Light* before *Converſion*, or becoming *Children of Light.* And again he ſaid *John* 3. 19. The condemnation of the World was not for want of Light, but for *Loving darkneſs* more then *Light*: Every Servant received a Talent, and it was ſaid *From him that had not ſhall be taken away even that which he hath.* All which intimats, that it is not want of Light, but not believing in nor taking heed to the Light that cauſeth Men to err. And *Prov:* 1. 23. *Turn ye at my Reproof, behold I will pouer out my*

Spirit

Spirit upon you, &c. 24. *I have called and ye refuſed, and I have ſtretched out my hand, and no man regarded.* verſe 25. *Ye have ſet at naught all my Counſells and would none of my reproofs*, 30 *They would none of my Counſel they deſpiſed all my reproofes; therefore they ſhall eat the fruits of their own waies.*

Hence it is manifeſt, That CHRIST the Light the Wiſdom of GOD, calls, reproves, ſtretcheth out his hand, offers his Councils even to ſuch as reject him, and do not regard him, and therefore are at laſt rejected by him.

And laſtly, The Experiences of all Ages ſheweth that it is a Law *engraven or imprinted on the Souls of all men* not to do that to another, which we would not ſhould be done to our ſelves. This the *Heathens* taught before *Chriſt* preached it; And therefore perſecution cannot be but eſteemed a ſin againſt Light, and tho *Paul* by the prejudice of his Education, and a blind Zeal for upholding of that Law or form of Worſhip which was to be aboliſhed did ignorantly and inconſideratly run on to perſecute the Saints: Yet it can no more be ſaid that he acted according to all he had for Light, then it can be ſaid that the *Presbyterians* acted according to the Scripture in the Murther of the Arch Biſhop.

And

And tho this may ſerve to anſwer the two following Arguments. Yet what ſeems to have weight in them, I ſhall take notice of.

His *Fourth* Argument is, *Divine Light is alwayes conſonant to it ſelf.* But the Light within one Man is quite contradictory and oppoſite to that within another, as the many and great Contraverſies in all ages do but too well make out.

This is eaſily anſwered, and no leſs eaſily retorted; For who dare deny but the Scriptures is alwayes conſonant to it ſelf; And yet how many and great are the Contraverſiies among theſe who profeſs it to be their only Rule. Was the Command of GOD to *Saul Dubious*, to deſtroy *Amaleck*? No, But *Saul* diſobeyed it. The like is the example of *Jonah*. Is not the Counſel of GOD alwayes conſonant to it ſelf, yet men reject it. And for his Argument from the pertinacy of *Heathens* and *Hereticks*. I am ready to think nothing of it, when I conſider the madneſs of mine own Country men, who would rather **choose to be hanged then pray for their Lawful King**, in obedience to a plaine Scripture precept.

All the Conntraverſies in the World, as well

well as all the Warrs are the product of mens lusts, and neither is the Scripture nor the Light culpable, but carnal corrupt minds of Men; Especially the Clergy: (See 1 *Corinth*: 3. and 3.

His *Fifth* Argument is a singular one, The substance whereof is, *There are many in the World* (whereof I am one sayes he) *who by all the Light they have attained to, and after an impartial search, firmlie believe, without so much as one thought from the Light within to the contrarie, that Quakerism is the pathway to utter destruction: It must therefore be so, if the Doctrine that every man must follow his Light, be true.*

This Argument is sufficiently Answered before, only his Instance of himself is strange, I would therefore ask him willingly, Had he never any check for all the Lies, Slanders, Perversions, and deceitful Insinuations published in his Book? If he say nay, I must say, Certainly the man is in a very desperate condition, and to be pittyed: But I doubt not the day shall come in which the *Light*, now by him so much despysed, will speak to him in a Language that shall not be very pleasing to him, and which all his deceitful Quibles cannot silence, I wish it may be

be in Mercy. His *Ipſe dixi* hath no force with me, He firmly believes, *That all the other Profeſſions of Chriſtianity except his own, are the path way to utter deſtruction*: It is therefore true? Becauſe, *dumb idol Shepherd* hath ſaid ſo, whoſe right Eye is utterly darkned, and whoſe right Hand is clean dryed up: If the light in him be darknes how great is that darkneſs?

His *Sixth* Argument is, *If GOD ſuffered the moſt part of men in the time of the Old Teſtament to walk in their own wayes, then all and every one hath not ſufficient Grace and Light, whereby they may come to Salvation*; But the former is true. *Ergo* the latter for proof of his *Minor*, he citeth *Acts* 14. 16. And telleth us that the Evidence of the Conſequence ſtrangly ſtraitneth *Bellarmine*.

But it doth not ſtraiten us, for we know that the Spirit of the LORD ſtrove with the Old World, & he *Called* and they *refuſed*. He *Gave his Counſel*, but they *rejected* it; therefore he ſuffered them to walk in their own wayes, *Rom:* 1. 10. *For the wrath of GOD is revealed from Heaven againſt all ungodlineſs and unrighteouſneſs of men*, &c: 19. *Becauſe that which may be known of GOD is manifeſt in them, for GOD hath ſhewed it unto them.* And verſe 21. *Becauſe when they knew*

knew GOD they glorified him not as GOD, &c: So in verſe 26. he ſaith, for this cauſe *GOD gave them up to vile affections*: So that GOD is juſt who requireth no more of man then he giveth him. And certainly ſome of theſe *Gentiles*, whom this Author and his brethren will have reprobats, and to have had no Light nor Knowledge of GOD, ſeem to have had more true Religion then many *Presbyterians* have at this day. For which, read *Morney du Pleſſe* (a *Proteſtant* Writter) his Book, called *Of the trueneſs of the Chriſtian Religion*, and *Auguſtine de Civitate Dei*: I could cite many Authors, but *William* Penn and *George Keith* have done it abundantly already. Only *Du Pleſſe* clearly proveth from thir Books, That they believed on GOD, *Father*, *Son*, and *Spirit*; The Creation of all things by him, the fall of Man, the immortality of the Soul, and futur rewards and puniſhments; Yea many things concerning the coming of Chriſt. Was not *Balaam* one of the *Gentiles?* Were *Job* and his friends *Iſraelites*, had they the Scriptures? I ſhall only cite two ſayings of *Seneca*; The firſt in his 74 Epiſtle at the end, *Nulla ſine DEO*, &c: Thus Engliſhed: *There is no good Mind without GOD*: "There are Di-

"vine

" vine Seeds ſown in the bodys of Men,
" which if a good Husbandman receiv-
" eth, then cometh forth Fruits like to
" their Original, and ariſe like unto
" thoſe of which they were born; But
" if an evil husband-man, then like bar-
" ren and wattriſh ground, it kills the
" ſeed and maketh filth in ſtead of Corn.
" And Epiſtle 41. GOD is nigh unto
" thee, He is with thee, He is in thee,
" The Holy Ghoſt ſitteth within us, an
" Obſerver and Keeper of all our Good
" and evil Actions, and as he is dealt
" with by us, ſo dealleth he with us.

Who told *Seneca* theſe things if he had no light? But *Epictetus*, his Motto *Bear* and *forbear* is an *Evangelick precept*, which I never yet knew a *Presbyterian* who had learned it: Neither needed our Author to have gone ſo farr back as the *Old Teſtament*: For GOD hath now ſuffered the *Presbyterians*, for many years to walk in their own wayes; For tho there was a good beginning among them many years ago; How ſoon they betook themſelves *to the arm of fleſh*, GOD left them to their own wayes, as *Samuel Rutherford* ſaith, *God turned his back upon them, and never ſince looked over his ſhoulder unto them.*

This

This may ſerve to anſwer his ſeventh argument drawn from *Epheſ*: 2. 12. Where the *Gentiles* are ſaid to be or have been without Chriſt, Aliens from the *common-wealth* of *Iſrael*, &c. Therefore they had not ſufficient Grace and Light; This again impeacheth the juſtice of GOD, to condemn men for breaking a Law which they never had contrary to that Scripture, where there is no Law, there is no tranſgreſſion: And if he had but conſidered the 3, 4 and 5 *Verſe* of the ſame Chapter, he would have found that *Paul* placeth himſelf, and the *Jews* in the ſame condition with the *Gentiles*; And the only difference was, that the *Jews* had the outward Law, which was added becauſe of tranſgreſſion, and yet could not make the comers thereunto perfect.

His *Eight* argument is from *Amos* 3. 2. *You have I known of all the Families of the Earth* And *Pſalm* 149. 19. 20. *He ſheweth his word unto Jacob his Statutes, and Judgements unto Iſrael*, &c.

From hence he inferrs that they who have not the *Scriptures*, *never had a Light ſufficient to guide them to Salvation*; But he is ſomewhat craftie in his expreſion, ſaying *Theſe to whom GOD did not give his word*, which

I fully grant; But if hereby he underſtands the Scriptures, it is great impudence to aſſert it, for then it will follow, that *Abel Enoch*, *Noah*, *Abraham*, *Job*, &c. Had never a light ſufficient to guide them to Salvation.

Then he raileth a little, and is very angry at ſuch as ſay, *The Light ſhined in the darkneſs, but the darkneſs comprehended it not.* He may, if he pleaſe, rail at me next, for telling him that the world was never condemned for want of Light, but for *loving darkneſs more then Light.* A little after he rants tho without reaſon, ſaying, *Now I ſay, who but a Quaker will from this inferr, that all Nations in all ages had the knowledge of the word Statutes and Judgements of GOD,* who but a *Presbyterian* will deny that GOD may be known without the Scriptures? And that the word of GOD is GOD, and was known before there was a Book in the World: As for the Statutes and Judgements given to Iſrael, they were peculiar to that Nation as his elder Brother *R: Baxter* hath confeſſed above, and *GOD is no reſpecter of perſons, but in every Nation he that feareth him, and worketh Righteouſneſs is accepted of him. Acts* 10. 34. And Doctor *Barron* againſt *Turnbul, page* 56. ſaith,

Potuit

Potuit DEUS olim imo etiam hodie potest sine Scriptura, Ecclesiam suam Colligere & tueri. That is, *GOD could of old, yea can at this day gather and defend his Church without Scripture.*

The next Scripture he mets with, is that of *Jude Vers.* 15. *That some men have not the Spirit.*

This *R: Barkelay* hath answered in *Quakerism* confirmed, citing the words of our Saviour; *Viz. From him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath*; Intimating thereby that men may be said in one sense to have, and in an other not to have the Spirit. To this our Author replyeth, that altho these wicked servants had gifts and abused them, yet no such thing can be said here, because they are said to be *twice dead*, &c. And senswal; But if it be lawful to look to the context (which in the end of this page he is very unwilling to allow unto us) he will find by the examples there adduced, that even they had something too; For in *Vers.* 5 and 6 he compares them to the children of Israel, who were brought out of *Ægypt*, and on their way to the *Land of Rest*, yet were destroyed for *unbelief*, and then *the Angels* (saith he) *who kept*

not

not their first Estate. Where it is manifest they had a *first Estate*, To which they might have kept, that they were *twice dead*, proves that they were *once Living*: And their being sensual, saith no more but that all such as reject the Counsel of the LORD, and dispise his reproofs, do (*as in the* 18 *Verse*) walk after their ungodly lusts, and become sensual more and more; Are not all men by nature sensual? And yet Christ *hath enlightned every man coming into the World*, is it not said, *the Spirit of the LORD departed from Saul, and an evil Spirit from GOD came upon him*; Yet at sometimes he was inforced to cry out, *thou art more Righteous then I, O my Son* David.

But the Spirit of GOD hath given us special symptoms, whereby we may know and discern these men, *viz.* The malicious cruelty of *Cain*, the insatiable avarice of *Ballaam*, the sedicious practices of *Korah*, and the speaking *evil of Dignities*; The first *three* speak for themselves, and for the *Fourth*, take this instance of the *Hind let loose*, where the Author speaking of King *Charles* the *Second*, sayeth, *Notwithstanding of all his numerous brood of Bastard brats, begotten in adultery, and Incest; Yet he died*

a Childs Iss poultron, and had the unlamented burial of an Ass, and none to succeed him but he who Murthered him. Horresco referens, &c.

Next he saith, *The knowledge of some things are absolutely necessary to Salvation; But all men have not this knowledge; therefore all men have not sufficient light to guide them unto Eternal life.*

This is a meer *Non sequitur*, such another as to say, some men shut their eyes and will not see: *Ergo*, the Sunshineth not. I have told him before that the World is not condemned for *want of light*, but for *loving darkness*, and I acknowledge where the Scriptures are to be had; The knowledge of them is indispensibly necessary, but where that canot be had, I say with Doctor *Barron*, GOD could of old, yea can at this day gather and defend his Church without Scripture: And I think our Author dar not say that the Spirit of Christ which taught the Apostles to write Scripture, cannot teach *men now all things necessary to Salvation:* Or if he say, that he hath limited himself, that he will not; I shall expect his proof of it by the next, for I believe no such thing as yet.

His *Ninthly* is no argument, but a new warr undertaken against the *Light of Christ*; He begins with his usual *froth*, saying, I will

will overthrow another principll of the *Quakers*, upon which the whole fabrick of *Quakeriſm* is builded; He had laid in his firſt argument, that the whole fabrick of *Quakeriſm* was overthrown: This then muſt be ſuperfluous, but the man forgets himſelf ſometimes, and muſt be pardoned.

He begins according to his cuſtom with three groſs lies; *1ſt*, that we aſſert that man in his *fallen eſtate* cannot do any thing that is as to the ſubſtance of the action good, for an unregenerate man may plow which is good as to the ſubſtance of the action, and yet the *Plowing of the wicked is ſin.*

Secondly, He accuſeth us as *Socinians*, whereas he himſelf is the *Socinian*, in that he acknowledgeth that fallen man by nature can know that *there is a GOD who is to be Loved*, *Feared*, and *Adored*; page 99. And *that we ought to do unto another as we would he ſhould do unto us*, page 110. This is to ſay, nature fallen and corrupted can *teach us to love GOD, and and our Neighbour* which is the *ſumm of the Law, and the Prophets*, againſt which *Socinian* Doctrine *R: B:* hath beſtowed more then a whole page of his apologie

His *Third* lie is, *that the whole World perceiveth clearly, that there is no light common*

to all mankind, except ſome ſmall Relicts of that once bright ſhinning Image of GOD, like the dim ſparkles of an extinguiſhed Lantron; And herein lyes the ſtreſs of the controverſie. We on the other hand aſſert, that when man had by his fall brought himſelf and his poſtetity into a miſerable condition, GOD had mercy on him, and entered into a new Covenant with him, in the *ſeed of the Woman, CHRIST JESUS*: Upon better terms then the *former Covenant*, and that Chriſt the *Light* did of new Enlighten him, or to uſe his own words; Light the Candle of that extinguiſhed Lantron, whereby he might ſee and know the things of GOD, and be ſaved from out of that miſerable eſtate whereinto he had brought himſelf by his fall, and that this is moſt conſonant to Scripture and ſound reaſon, will appear by the *Sequel.*

Firſt, The Covenant of works was made with *Adam* in his integrity, and the *Covenant of Grace* was made with man in his fallen eſtate, and confirmed to *Abraham* and *David*, and all dureing the Law, and ratified by the *Death of Chriſt* under the Goſpel. Now the the queſtion here is, whether the Covenant of Grace left mankind in the ſame condition it found him?

That

That is to the dim ſparkles of an extinguiſhed Lantorn, which (our Author ſaith) are never able to ſhew the wandering traveler in the dark night his way homeward, or whether Chriſt the Mediator of this *Covenant the Light*, which enlightneth every man coming into the World, did give unto man light and grace ſufficient for fullfilling the Terms of this *New Covenant*? For to deny, this were to impeach the juſtice of GOD: For that *Adam* had ſufficient Light, Grace, and Power, to fulfill the Terms of the *Firſt Covenant*, I hope our Author will not deny; And to aſſert, that his Poſterity had not Light nor Grace ſufficient to fulfil the Terms of the *Second Covenant*, were no leſs then to ſay, that men were nothing bettered by the *Covenant of Grace*, but were left to ſeek their way with their extinguiſhed Lanthorn; And that the Old World was drowned, and they damned for want of Light, or Knowledge of the Will of GOD, which is abſurd as well as contrary to the Scriptures: For the Spirit of GOD ſtrove with them, and told *Cain*, that if he did well, he ſhould be accepted, and if he did evil, ſin lay at the door: Which ſaying preſuppoſeth that *Cain* knew the Good and the evil. Did not Chriſt preach to the Old

World

World in the dayes of *Noah*, 1 *Pet*: 3.19. And if this be true, that fallen man had no Law nor Light, but an extinguiſhed Lanthorn, by what Law could the men of *Sodom* and *Gomorah* be condemned? I know nothing he can ſay to this, but that *direful Doctrine* of *Reprobation*, which yet will not ſerve his turn.

Secondly That this Light wherewith Chriſt hath enlightned every man, is ſupernatural & ſufficient, is ſo largely proved by *Samuel Fiſher*, *William Penn*, *George Keith*, and *Ro: Barkelay*, and all the Objections anſwered, is nottour to any who hath been at pains to read their Writings, ſo that it might ſuffice to direct my Reader thereto; Yet ſhall I take notice of what ſeems to have any weight.

In the firſt he comes above board, and calls it *Reaſon*; And then ſayes (for I wave his railing and reflections) "Reaſon "is Natural, and Man is Rational, That "Man exerciſing his Reaſon and con-"templating the Works of Creation and "Providence, cannot but conclude that "they are the Product of an *Infinite* and "*Omnipotent Creator*, who is to be *Loved*, "*Feared*, and *adored*, which thoughts "as to the ſubſtance of the Action are "cer-

" certainly good. And what ſaith all thi to the purpoſe? Are not the prayers and plowing of the wicked as good as to the ſubſtance of the Action, and yet ſin?

But the Queſtion is, Whether man had no other Principle in him, whereby he could diſcern theſe things, but his natural and corrupt Reaſon, which was the thing incumbent upon him to prove, and which he hath wholly omitted; Seeing the Apoſtle ſaith, *The natural man cannot diſcern the Things of GOD.*

His *Second* Argument is, Whatever is in man, and common to all Mankind is Natural, but ſome ſparks of the Knowledge of a *Deitie*, and ſome good Thoughts as the deſire of ſelf-preſervation are in man, & common to all Mankind: *Ergo*, c&c.

The *Major* is falſe, otherwayes it would follow, *That the Grace of GOD which bringeth to Salvation* (which is in Man) *and hath appeared to all Men*, muſt be *Natural*, and the *Life of Chriſt*, the *Light of Men* muſt be *Natural*, both which are abſurd.

His *Third* is much to the ſame purpoſe, *That which is originally born with every* Man, *and groweth up to more and more maturity.* &c. is undoubtedly natural, *but ſome remainders of the Knowledge of God are originally, that is in the*

the Principle or Inclination, born with Man, and grows up to more and more maturity, according to the growth of him in whom they are, Ergo, &c. They are Natural.

Certainly if this Argument hold, a Man that lives long and grows up to a great hight, muſt acquire a great Knowledge of God, which is ridiculous: And *Seneca* had more Knowledge than this Author, as before cited, who ſaid, There were *Divine Seeds ſown in Man, which grew according to the entertainment they mett with:* And whether this of *Seneca* be more conſonant to our Saviour's Parable of the *Sower* and the *Seed*, than our Author's Argument, let the Reader judge. The Seed was ſown by Chriſt in all Grounds; the Seed grew. *Ergo* (according to our Author) it was *Natural*; And the Talents were given to the profitable and unprofitable Servants, and they grew as they were improved; *Ergo*, they were *Natural*.

His *Fourth* Argument is, *That which is common to Devils, is not ſupernatural; But to know and believe that there is a God, which is of it ſelf a good thought, is common to Devils, Ergo*, &c.

When our Author gives us a learned Treatiſe of the *Nature of Angels*, of their

Fal,

Fall, and what they *Loſt*, and what they *Retained*; And tells us whence he learned it, and then proves, that Men and the Devils in their nature, in their Fall and ſince their Fall, are in all things alike, he may have an Anſwer: For my part, I ſeek not to be wiſe above what is revealed; I know that Men and Angels Fell, and that Man was *Redeemed by Chriſt*, and not the Devils; And that he purchaſed for Man Grace, whereby he might attain to *Faith*, *Repentance*, and *New Obedience*; which are the Terms of the *Second Covenant*. I know alſo the Devils believe that there is a God, and that this their belief of His immutable Juſtice, is no ſmall part of their preſent as well as future Torment; whereby they know that they ſhall be eternally tormented in Hell. And if ever our Author come there, (which God forbid) he will find this to be a part of his Torment too, and not part of his Nature, as he would inſinuate in his next Argument, where he ſaith, *That which will accompany the Wicked to Hell, cannot be called Grace, Divine, or any thing ſupernatural.* He ſhould have ſaid, that which *ſuffereth in Hell*: For certainly all that is natural to Man muſt ſuffer in Hell, but that which cauſeth

Man

Man to ſuffer in Hell can be no part of his Nature: Hence *Cauſin* in his *Holy Court Tom.* 3. *Pag.* 433. "The Darkneſs of Hell "is apprehended as a moſt intollerable Evil, and that with juſt cauſe: Notwithſtanding I affirm the greateſt Torment of "the Damned, and hight of their notable "Calamities, is Light, I ſay, Light of "Science and Knowledge, *&c.*

His *Sixth* Argument is, "That Men "have naturally ſome Relicks of the Image of God, and can do ſome things "contained in the Law of God, we muſt "firmly conclude from that expreſs Text, "*Rom.* 2. 14. *The Gentiles who have not the "Law, do by Nature the things contained in "the Law.*

Firſt, He proceeds upon his former deceitful Inſinuations, as if we denied that fallen Man, or Man in the Fall could do any Action good, as to the ſubſtance, (as he ſaith now) he can do ſome things contained in the Law of God; whereas the Devil could confeſs Chriſt before Men, as in *Luke* 4. 34. *I know thee who thou art, the Holy One of God.*

This is a meer Quibble: For the Queſtion is, Whether Man by *Nature* as *fallen* and *corrupted*, can do any thing that is ac-

acceptable to God? which he ſhould have proven, or elſe been ſilent. And as to that Scripture he citeth, it maketh nothing for, but againſt him: For clearing of which, I ſhall ask him this Queſtion. Whether the Actions done by theſe *Gentiles* (who not having the Law, did by *Nature* the things contained in the Law, which ſhew the work of the Law written in their Hearts) were acceptable to God, or not? If he ſay, not: He contradicts the Apoſtle, *Verſ.* 26. *Therefore if Uncircumciſion keep the Righteouſneſs of the Law, ſhall not his Uncircumſion be counted for Circumciſion?* And Verſ. 27. *And ſhall not Uncircumciſion which is by nature, if it fulfil the Law, judge thee who by the Letter and Circumciſion, doſt tranſgreſs the Law?* And *Act.* 10. 34, 35. *Of a truth I perceive that God is no reſpecter of perſons, but in every Nation, he that feareth him, and worketh Righteouſneſs, is accepted of him.* If he ſay, theſe Actions done by the ſtrength of fallen and corrupted Nature were acceptable to God; then it follows, that Man by Nature in the Fall, can pleaſe God, and ſo have no need of a Saviour. I ſhall here add a Saying of *J. Humfrey*, with the Approbation foreſaid of *R. Baxter*, in his Book of *Election* and *Redemption*, *Pag.* 29.

39. "It is agreeable to that Righteouſneſs "of God, which is revealed in the Go-"ſpel, and to common Reaſon, that when "Chriſt died to Redeem the World from "the Law of Works, becauſe through the "weakneſs of the Fleſh, it was impoſſible "for us to perform the ſame; The new "Terms which he hath procured for us "in the remedying Law, ſhould be ſo a-"dopted to our fallen Eſtate, as to be made "no leſs poſſible for us, or within our "power now, than the Covenant of Na-"ture was to *Adam* in the ſtate of Inno-"cency. There is no Interpretation of "Scripture muſt be admitted againſt uni-"verſal Reaſon and the Goodneſs of God. "Now to ſay, that the Juſt and Merciful "GOD would require fallen Man to walk "without Light, to act without Power, "is contrary to the Goodneſs of GOD "and univerſal Reaſon, and to the Tenor "of the new and remedying Covenant.

In page 104, He ſaith, *Men by nature have the knowledge of Politicks and the prudent management of Worldly affairs; Therefore men may be ſaid to have the Law writen in their Hearts without a New Covenant diſpenſation; Becauſe the ſecond table of the Law which is a Rule for Politicks, is the Law of GOD as well as the firſt.* This

This can import nothing leſs then this, That becauſe he had natural and corrupt reaſon, he had nothing more; Or that he that hath his ſenſes hath not Reaſon: For *Nimrod* had Politicks and ſo had *Moſes*, but *Nimrod* had not ſuch a foundation for his *Politicks*; And why? Becauſe *Moſes* Government was a *Theocracie*; *Nimrods* an humane Monarchy; And therefore *Moſes* needed the immediat Teachings of GOD for his Politicks; *Nimrod* only Reaſon; Tho he had more, if he had regarded it. And yet the ſecond Table of the Law is more like *Penal Statutes* then *Politick Laws*. And whereas he ſaith, That *Jo: Brown* hath proven by many demonſtrations, that the writing of the Law in the Heart cannot at all be taken in this place, for any part of the New Covenant; He might have been ſo kind to his Reader, as to have given one of theſe many demonſtrations, before he had ſo railed at and gloryed over his Adverſary: Eſpecially, conſidering that *John Browns* Books are ſo rare to be ſeen, and ſeldom or never objected to us by any man of ſenſe.

His next is in anſwer to R: B's: ſaying, If *Romans* 2. 14. Be underſtood of corrupt nature, It would contradict that of

1 *Cor*: 2. 14. Where it is ſaid, *The Natural Man cannot know the things of GOD.*

To which he Replyes, That Mr. *Brown*, as he calls him, hath utterly denyed this contradiction to follow upon their expoſition of this place; But hath neither given us the Expoſition, nor the Harmony of the places; This might paſs in the Pulpit, but it is ſhameful in Print, he had better waved it as he hath done many more: But if the Reader will be at the pains to look *Beza*'s Notes, he will find that he expreſly ſaith on 1 *Cor*: 2. 14. *The Natural man is he that hath no further Light of Unſtanding then that which he hath brought with him, even from his Mothers womb*, As *Jude* defineth it. *Verſe* 19. And upon the word, *Spiritual Man*, he hath noted, That is by Vertue of the *Holy Ghoſt*. Now let the Reader compare what our Author hath ſaid in the foregoing page upon *Rom*: 2. 14. And what *Beza* ſaith upon 1 *Cor*: 2. 14. And ſee whether our Anthors anſwer be ſufficient to take away the contradiction: Yet we muſt get *Foam* and *Froath* not a little, the uſuall product of troubled waters: Nevertheleſs, it is manifeſt, this one note of *Beza*'s, overturns all he hath ſaid for his extinguiſhed Lanthorn.

In

In page 105. After a citation of R: B's words concerning the *fall of man*, he ſaith, " It willl be counted a compleat Contra- " diction to ſay, that fallen man hath no " Reliƈts of the Image of GOD, and yet " hath a Seed of Righteouſneſs, ſeeing " that Righteouſneſs is one of the chief " parts of the Image of GOD. But wherein lyeth the Contradiction here? In ſaying, he who hath the Seed, hath not the Fruit? Or in ſaying, that the Seed tho ſown in all kinds of Grounds, needs an influence from Heaven before it can bring forth Fruit? And (to uſe his own ſimilitude) till the Candle of his extinguiſhrd Lanthorn be of new lighted again, it can do us no good, nor affoord us any Light but ſmoak and ſtink: But the abſurdities are his own in contradiƈting the *Weſtminſter Catechiſm*; Which to the Queſtion, *What is original ſin?* Anſwereth, *It is the want of Original Righteouſneſs, and the corruption of our whole nature*, &c. Now let the Reader compare this Anſwer with our Authors Doƈtrine; Who ſaith, *That fallen man hath ſo much Original Righteouſneſs, as to Know, Love, Fear, and Adore the Infinite and Omnipotent GOD, and to do to others as he would be done by*, which our Saviour

ſayes

ſayes are the two great commandements, And then conſider how conſonant he is to his Principles. But all theſe abſurdities, and many more they are forced to run into for defence of that *Abyſs* of abominations; their darling Doctrine of *Abſolute Reprobation.*

After this being conſcious to himſelf, he hath ſaid nothing to purpoſe, he flyeth to the covers of deceit, and refuge of Lies; Saying, "There is a Myſtery latent "under this Doctrine, which we muſt "here diſcover; The *Quakers* have no "other Chriſt then this that was left in "*Adam*, and remaineth in man in his "fallen condition, to which they give "many great Names, as Light, Life, "meaſure of GOD, GOD Himſelf, and "moſt frequently the Seed. Then he citeth ſome broken Paſſages out of Books, which whether true or falſe I am indifferent; For they are chiefly out of two Books of *George Keiths* yet unanſwered; And if our Author pleaſe to enter the liſts with him, I ſhall be willing to be a Spectator; Till then it is curriſh manners to ſnarle at his heels, while he dare not ſet his face to it. But I pray thee *Patroclus*, ſhould I ſet my ſelf to pick out ſentences

out

out of *Presbyterian Books*; What a Hodge podge of Nonesense and Blasphemy could I make up together? Thinkest thou they did well who have presently published that Pamphlet of the *Presbyterian Eloquence*? But that Consequence thou drawest from these thy assertions, is such a horrid and detestable Lie, as needs no other Answer, *But the LORD rebuke that lying Spirit, that is gone forth, and entered the mouths of the Presbyterian Clergie.* He who searcheth our Hearts knoweth that we are falsly accused, And that we owne no other Christ but Jesus the Son of the living GOD, and the *Virgin Mary.* And I hope all Men of Candor and Ingenuity will acknowledge that we should know what we believe better then this malicious Railer doth; So I hope they will hereafter give no credit to him nor his Brethren, thus misrepresenting us, as about the end of page 107 He saith, *We believe, or at least would perswade others to believe that Christ hath a Personal Union with every Son and Daughter of Adam!* O! impudent Slanderer, the poyson of Asps is under his tongue.

Next he calls it Blasphemy to say, *That the Seed needs a new Visitation to raise it up:*

But hath not told us where the Blaſphemy lyeth.

In page 108, To clear his Brother *John Brown* of the abſurdity of aſſerting that the *Devils and all unregenerate men are in a certain reſpect Spiritual, and the Apoſtle and all Regenerate men are in a certain reſpect carnal*; He giveth us a very ready ſolution of it thus: Whatever is a Spirit may be called Spiritual, and whatever is a body may be called Corporal, and ſo the Devil is a ſpirit, and unregenerate men have ſouls: Therefore they are ſpiritual, and the Apoſtle had fleſh, therefore he was Carnal. To prove this further, he ſaith *John Brown* hath given 15 *arguments*; Whereof our Author could not beſtow one upon us, but if they be no better then the laſt we got he hath done well to be frugall of his paper, and think it enough to vaper a little, and tell us all theſe are but *fillions*, *bobgoblins* fit only to fright children.

His ſeventh argument is, " If fallen
' man retain no knowledge of GOD, no
' principles of common honeſty & mora-
' lity, then there is no difference betwixt a
' Man and a bruit, neither can it be told
' in what the Wiſdom of the wiſe *Gentiles*
' conſiſted

' consisted, of whom the Apostle speaketh
' 1 *Cor:* 2. Who notwithstanding could
' not perceive the things of GOD, until
' they were again revealed, but the latter
' is false in both its parts, therefore the
' *First*.

Answer, this argument serveth only to make a muster, the substance whereof hath been handled before, for it is grounded upon the false supposition that Mankind received no benefite by the *second Covenant*, but was left in that miserable condition brought upon him by the fall, which is contrary to the scope of the whole Scripture, and our Author hath been so wary as to contradict it himself in his very arguments; *Saying*, who notwithstanding could not perceive the things of GOD, untill they were again revealed, whereas he hath said before, *That man by nature could know and understand the first and second Table of the Law; Yea know GOD to be Infinite, Omnipotent, and that he should be loved, feared and Adored, and that we should love our Neighbour as our self*, which is nothing more then to do to others as we would be done by; What need then of a *new Revelation*, seeing this is the Law and the Prophets. He citeth 1 *Cor:* 2. In all which

Chapter I can find nothing but what contradicts him to his Teeth, and *Beza*'s note at the end of it is, *We are indued with the Spirit of Christ, who openeth unto us these secrets which by all other means are unsearchable.* (*Mark*) and also all truth whatsoever. Now if all Truth whatsoever be unsearchable without the Spirit of Christ, as *Beza* saith they are, what is become of our Authors dark Lantern, whereby, as by the light of corrupt nature he will have men to know that great truth, the foundation of all Truth, *Viz.* That there is an *Infinite* and *Omnipotent GOD, who is to be Loved, Feared and Adored.* Add to this, That no man *knoweth the Father but the Son, and he to whom the Son shall Reveal him*; And then let the Reader consider whether *Beza* and the Scriptures are better to be believed then our Author his dark Lantern. As to the Wisdom of the Wise *Gentiles*, there is a Wisdom whereby GOD is known; and a Wisdom whereby GOD is not known; So saith the Scripture, The *World through Wisdom knew not GOD*, and that some men were bruitish in their knowledge, and as *Jude* saith, what they knew naturally as bruit beasts in these things, they corrupt themselves; This is

Mans

Mans natural Wiſdom: But *Job* who was one of the wiſe *Gentiles*, tells us that the *Inſpiration of the Almighty giveth underſtanding: Ariſtotle* alſo, Another of the wiſe *Gentiles*, tells us in his *Ethicks Lib:* 10, Chap: 4. 7. *They that did theſe things did them not as men, but as having ſomething Divine, or of GOD in them*; And *Dindymus* ſaid to *Alexander* the *Great*: *If thou wilt hearken to my words, thou ſhalt poſſeſs of my goods, who have GOD to my friend, and whoſe inſpiration I injoy within me.* I have inſtanced *Ariſtotle* to him already, next let him hear *Plato*, whom he alſo nameth; *Phæd: The Light and Spirit of GOD*, ſaith he, are as *Wings to the Soul*, or as that which raiſeth up the Soul into a ſenſible *Communion with GOD* above the World, which the mind of man is ready to bemire it ſelf with.

It could add many more, but theſe may ſuffice to ſhew, that the wiſe *Gentiles* derived their knowledge of GOD from an higher principle then our Authors dark Lantern; I ſhall only add one; to wit, *Philo* the *Jew*, *Leg: Alleg: Lib:* 1. *How ſhould the Soul of man know GOD, if he did not inſpire her, and take hold of her by his Divine Power.*

In *page* 110 he ſaith the defect of the Wiſdom of the *Heathens* was in this, that

that they could nôt perceive Chriſt, but he ſhould have remembred the laſt words of *Plato* whom he nameth, related by *Marcilius Ficinus*, who wrote his life, being asked by ſome that viſited him, *how long men ſhould attend to his writings?* He anſwered, *till that more Holy and Divine Perſon ſhould appear to viſit the World, whom all men ought to follow*; And that Elogue of *Virgil* (which ſeems to have at firſt cracke him) is a plain intimation of their knowledge of the comming of Chriſt, and that they did not receive him when he came is not to be attributed to their want of Light, any more then the *Phariſees*, who had the Law and the *Prophets*; For we ſee that many of the *Gentiles* were more ready to receive the Goſpel, then theſe learned *Rabbies* who thought they had Eternal Life in the Scriptures. As for the difference between a Man and a brute, it is reaſon which GOD gave for the Government, and preſervation of the outward man, for which ſee *Poiret*.

In page 111. He tells us a Hen hath skill in Arithmetick; If this be true, certainly the *Presbyterian hens* muſt be wiſer then ours, for our women who look after the poultry, aſſure me that our Hens have

have no ſuch skill, but that a *cunning man* like our Author, *may ſteall half her Eggs from her, and never be quarrelled.* If he read *Le Grands Natural Hiſtory*, he may get better Inſtances; But this is ridiculous.

His eight Argument is from *Rom:* 1. 19. 20. *Becauſe that which may be known of GOD, is manifeſt in them, for GOD hath ſhewed it unto them.* From hence he concludes, that there is ſome Reliques of the *Divine Image* or *Natural Knowledge* left in Man: And to ſay, that the true Knowledge of GOD and Divine Things, is not *Natural Man*, but the Fruits of Chriſts purchaſe to Mankind, after the *Fall*, in and by the *Covenant of Grace*; This he calls *pure Paganiſm.* And to prove all this, he only cryes, *Who would dare to ſay or affirm, that what was common to the* Heathens, *Yea, and Devils alſo, was as really ſaving, and the Fruit of Chriſts purchaſe, as that which is proper to the Godly.*

Anſwer, I verily believe, the Devils have more knowledge then he, how they came by it, I am not concerned, he may ask them when he hath occaſion; But I know none ever aſſerted it to be ſaving, except it be his Brother *John Brown*, when he printed his Preaching to them. But

Mankind

Mankind was not left in the ſame condition; *For Chriſt was preached to them immediatly after the fall*; And to deny that they received Grace, were to contradict the Scriptures, *For that the Seed ſown in the ſtoney ground, and in the Good Ground was the ſame*, none but *a Presbyterian* will deny. And *that the Tallent given to the unfaithful ſervant, was as true Money as the reſt, I think all will confeſs*; Or elſe how could he have been condemned for not improving it. So that if he condemn us here, he muſt condemn the Scriptures with us; Which alſo ſaith, *That GOD wills all men to be ſaved*: But here they tells us, *That GOD hath a revealed Will to ſave them, and yet a ſecret will to damn them.* O impudent and perverſe Generation! *Who dare accuſe the Righteous GOD of Truth with hypocriſie*, The wiſe Gentiles whom they reject, would have abhored ſuch doctrine. Moreover, it is very abſurd to ſay from this Scripture, *Rom.* 1. 19. That man had the Knowledge of GOD by Nature: For *Firſt*, The Apoſtle ſaith, *It was manifeſt in them, not in the Creatures without them* (tho that was alſo an Adminacle to help their Knowledge) *but their Knowledge was inward, and all that might be known, therefore not any*

Imper-

imperfect Knowledge. And Secondly, *GOD hath ſhewed it unto them*; That is, *GOD hath manifeſted or revealed to man in himſelf that which may be known of GOD*; *For the words Shewed and Manifeſted, are the ſame in the Greek*, and very conſonant to that other laying of the ſame Apoſtle; *The things of GOD can no man know but by the Spirit of GOD.*

In the reſt of page 112. and 113. He takes the Liberty to ſcold, raile, and lie at random; All which I paſs by except this: *And yet* (ſaith he) *this Natural Light is to the Quakers their God, their Chriſt, their Grace, and whatſoever elſe is neceſſary to Salvation.* To prove this, he giveth us an heap of Citations, which it ſeems he hath gathered from his Brethren *Hicks* and *Faldo*, the known Forgers. I ſhall ſhew his diſingenuity in the firſt of theſe Citations, by ſetting down *William Penn*'s words, whereby the Reader may know whoſe footſteeps our Author hath followed.

" Chriſtian *Quaker*, page 116 If then " the Life of the Word be the Light of " Men, unleſs the Life of the Word be " Natural, the Light of it muſt be ſuper- " natural, Divine and Infinite, as be-

comes

" comes the Life of the Word to be;
" And this checks the dull ignorance or
" base deceit of *Thomas Hicks* who either
" could not or would not understand
" *George Whitehead*, when he said (the
" Light must needs be Divine, because
" the Life from whence it comes is so,
" and the Effect is alwayes of the same
" nature with the cause) in any other
" sense then this; That because (saith
" *T: Hicks*, GOD is the cause of Beasts
" and Trees, therefore they are God.
" Which strange Construction of *George*
" *Whitehead*'s words, bewrays either great
" stupidity or disingenuity, I would ask
" the very angry man, Is there no effect
" of Power beside that of Nature? Did
" the Father of T: H: beget a Beast or a
" Man when he begat him? Surely un-
" less he has abandoned all understand-
" ing, me thinks, he that makes in his
" Book so notable a distinction betwixt
" Reason and Railing, by using so little
" of the one, and so much of the other,
" should put one betwixt a Natural and
" Potential Effect, I mean such an Effect
" as proceeds from Nature, and one that
" comes from meer Power. The Di-
" vine Life can naturally produce nothing

" that

" that is not as Divine as it ſelf; But its " Power had made all that is not of its ſelf, " as well inanimate as animate Beeings.

I have ſet down *William Penn*'s words at length, That the Reader may ſee, how little Conſcience theſe men make of *traducing honeſt Men*; And that our Author cares not to joyn with *Anabaptiſts*, *Independents* (whom he accounts *Heretickſ*) Yea, to rake Hell rather then to want ſome Lie to alledge againſt the *Quakers*, wherefore I ſhall trouble you no more with his Citations, being fully Anſwered by others, but ſhall proceed to ſee what more he hath to ſay.

In the end of page 115 he falls a railing and clamouring diſperatly, Telling us, that by this dim light, Men have enough adoe to perceive that there is a Supream Beeing, what then is become of his late great aſſertions; That this dim light of Nature, Reaſon, Conſcience, extinguiſhed Lantern, *&c. Could teach men that there was one GOD, that he was Infinite, Omnipotent, to be Loved, Feared, and Adored*, and *to do to others as they would be done by*, which is the ſubſtance of the *Law* and the *Prophets*; This is confuſion and contradiction with a Witneſs, yet he glories in the

end

end, and heaps togeher lies in Hypocrſie, which deſerve no anſwer.

In *page* 116, He would inſinuat, that we depreſs the light as much as formerly we had exalted it, becauſe when ſome pretending to it have erred, we ſay, their Doctrines are to be ſubjected to the Judgement of the Church, This he calls *Popery*, and at laſt worſe, *Viz.* A ſubjecting of Chriſt and GOD to another, as capable of deceiving and being deceived.

But I would know from this windie man whether if he or any *Presbyterian* ſhould teach any Doctrine contrary to the Covenant and Confeſſion of Faith, and pretend Scripture for it, I ſay, whether he would be lyable to the Judgement of the *General Aſſembly*, and whether it were the mans pretences, or the Scriptures, which the *Aſſembly* takes upon thē to judge even ſo we neither take upon us to judge Chriſt, nor his Light, *which can neither deceive nor be deceived*; But the deceit and folly of ſuch pretenders as our Author and his Brethren who pretend to the Scriptures, and neither underſtand them, nor walk according to them.

In the next place, after a little of his accuſtomed froath, he ſaith, *he will propoſe and enervat thoſe of their Arguments which ſeem*

to

to be moſt ſtrong, &c. And begins with *George Keith*, citing, Truth defended, *page* 87, but is *page* 85. *A Divine Law in all men, is an inward immediate dictate, but there is a Divine Law in all men, ergo*, &c. To this he anſwereth by denying the Minor, which I cannot bnt admire, ſeeing *George Keith* hath ſo abundantly proven it in the ſame page, yet never noticed by our Author: But he thinks he hath guarded himſelf ſufficiently in his *Preface* to the *Reader*, by forbidding them to touch or handle ſuch unclean things, as *George Keiths* books; But all this deceit will not cover him, for *George Keith* tells him, *Firſt*, that he hath proven this by many arguments in his book of *Immediat Revelation*. *Secondly* the *Americans* (whom his Adverſary names) tranſgreſs the Divine Law, therefore they have a Divine Law: For where there is no Law there is no tranſgreſſion. And thirdly, he cited Biſhop *Sanderſon*, ſaying, *the Law in the hearts of all men, is as really the word of GOD as that Printed in our Bibles*; But *Patroclus* reads not this, and therefore makes ſhort work with it, and glories as if he had Vanquiſhed *Euforbis*, by whoſe Dart *Patroclus* fell.

The next he attempts is *R: B's*: Vindi-

cation

cation *page* 39. But this is no Argument as he would falſly inſinuate, but written to ſtop the Mouth of a windy man, *J. Brown*, charging him with Blaſphemy.

But he proceeds page 118. *That which we ſin in not obeying is ſufficient to Salvation, but in not obeying the Light within, we ſin; Therefore it is ſufficient to Salvation. Anſwer, First*, he hath neither told us where, nor by whom this Argument is uſed, and may be his own for any thing I know; But *Secondly*, he ſeems to confeſs that they ſin who do not obey the Light; And *Thirdly*, his anſwer is very nonſenſical, to wit, it is ſin to diſobey the Lawful commands of Parents, which commands are not ſufficient to Salvation; But what made that diſobedience to Parents to be ſin; If the Law of GOD had not commanded obedience to them? Every ſin is a tranſgreſſion of the Law of GOD, and therefore every ſin preſuppoſeth a Divine Law, and here I muſt tell him that his brother the author of *Melius Inquirendum* tells him " page 303. All that conſcience dictats as " a Counſelour, all that Conſcience deter- " mines as a judge, is in the name of the " Supream and Soveraign *JEHOVAH*, " adding there is one Lawgiver who is able

" to

" to Save and to deſtroy, and a little after " Conſcience hath in its Commiſſion to " dictate before the fact, as well as to re- " flect upon the fact, it teaches what we " ought to do as well as examine whe- " ther we have done well or not. By theſe it appears this man was of the mind, that that there was a Divine Law in all men, call it by what name he will.

Next he comes to *John* 1, 9. That was the true light, which enlighteneth every man coming into the World, where he giveth two gloſſes of it; *J. Browns*, *Firſt*, that *Light may be taken for the Light of* reaſon; This is nonſence. as if man could be a man without reaſon; It is every man not every bruit he enlighteneth, and till we underſtand more, we believe it is reaſon makes the difference, ſo the gloſs muſt run thus, he enlighteneth every reaſonable creature with the light of Reaſon. The *Second* gloſs is, that by every man, is not to be underſtood every individual, but only every one which ſavingly enlightened; Upon this *R: B:* ſaith he is puzled with this Scripture, for he knoweth not what way to take it, Whereupon our airy Author inſults, ſaying, *He inferrs penurie from abundance*;

Put

But, ſayes he, *I remembred they were Enemies to Logick*; But leſs froath might have ſufficed; For I am ſure, if he had not been puzled he would never have given two ſuch contrary Expoſitions, The firſt making the Light *meerly natural*, yet *Univerſal*. The ſecond Gloſs, making it *ſaving* and *ſupernatural*. but *ſpecial* and not *Univerſal*; Which evidently ſhews that *Jo: Brown* and our Author who would defend him are both in *Babel*. And therefore it being a matter of Conſequence to know, whether the Life of Chriſt which is the Light of Men, the Light wherewith every Man is inlightned be Natural or Supernatural, Univerſal or Special, Saving or Damning; It concerns our Adverſary to conſult the *General Aſſembly*, which of the two Gloſſes may be beſt to hold by, ſeing both cannot ſtand. In the reſt of this page he doth nothing but undervalue his Adverſary, whether Juſtly let the Reader Judge.

His next Combat is with *John* 1. 5. *The darkneſs comprehended it not*: He ſaith, *That by darkneſs is meant man in his natural Eſtate, in which Eſtate he can comprehend what is Natural*: Whence he inferrs that man in this eſtate is void of all Spiritual and

Su-

Supernatural Light; Which Inference is void of all Sense and Reason, for the very words before it are, *The Light shined in the darkness*, That is (according to our Author) Man in his Natural Estate, who could comprehend natural things, but could not comprehend the Light; Therefore (according to our Author his own *Confession*) The Light must be *Supernatural*, or else the *darkness* would have comprehended it. After a little vapour he saith, *Altho the Light Christ be supernatural, yet the little Beams and Sparks of Reason and Conscience are Natural.* But who ever denyed this? The thing he was to prove as well as assert; Was, *That the Life of Christ which is the Light of Men, and the Light which Men are commanded to believe in, is Natural*: Which he may either do or be silent for ever. Next he rails a while, and concluds with an abominable Lie, *Viz*: That we assert, *That the dim and dark Light of Nature is GOD himself*: This he hath learned from the **Father of Lies** the **Prince of Darkness**, and to **him** it will return, and he with it, except he repent.

The next Argument he deals with, is R. B.'s page 19. 20. of his *Vindication*; I shall intreat the Reader to look the place,

and compare it with our Authors bungling upon it; R: B: proveth by *Rom:* 8. 9. 14. 1 *John* 2. 27. *John* 6. 45. *John* 14. 16. 17. That the Promiſes of the Spirit to teach, lead and guide, were common to all Believers and not particular to the Apoſtles: To which our Author replys, he ſhould have given ſome other thing for proof then bare Aſſertions; For ſo he calls all the Scripture proofs he hath brought, but meddles not with one word of them: But our Adverſary will not ſerve us ſo, he will give us Queſtions for all, and ask us, Why may not *Immediat Objective Revelation* be promiſed to the Apoſtles in theſe places, and yet not to all Believers? *Anſwer*, Becauſe GOD had promiſed before to *powr out his Spirit upon all fleſh*; And *Paul* tells us after, *If any man have not the Spirit of Chriſt, he is none of his.* As for the Scriptures he cites, they nothing touch us, for we never denyed the uſe of Means in the leadings of the ſame Spirit, as R: B: hath ſhewn at large in the place laſt cited.

But in ſtead of a ſolid Anſwer to R: B's Argument, he boldly beggs the Queſtion; Saying, *Whatever the Quakers ſay we cannot help it*; Certain it is, that no man of ſound Judgement will deny, that when one reads the

the Scriptures, and hath his mind Illuminated by the Spirit; he hath that promiſe fulfilled to him of which we now ſpeak. Very well *Patroclus*, This is more like a a *Pope* then a *Prevbyter*; But the man hath told us he cannot help it.

The next Argument he aſſaults, R: B's Apologie page 38. *That which all Profeſſors of Chriſtianity of whatſoever kind, are forced ultimatly to recurr unto, when preſſed to the laſt; That for becauſe of which all other foundations are recommended and accounted worthy to be believed, and without which they are granted to be of no weight at all, muſt needs be the only, moſt true, certain, and unmoveable foundation of all Chriſtian Faith; But Inward, Immediat Objective Revelation by the Spirit, is That,* &c: *Ergo,* &c.

To this he offers two Anſwers: The firſt by a *Simile* thus, *A man juſt now poſſeſſing a peece of Land formerly enjoyed by his Anceſtors, by vertue of a Right granted to them by a Prince deceaſed many ages ago, ſpake mouth to mouth with that Prince dead ages out of mind; Thus that into which the preſent Poſſeſſor of ſuch peece of Land, when preſſed to the laſt recurreth unto, and for which other Grounds or Charters are comended or valide; Muſt of neceſſity be the moſt immoveable ground of and warrand for*

such a peece of Land his poſſeſſion of it: But the Grant or Donation of ſuch or ſuch a Prince given many ages ago. Firſt, *By word of mouth, tho again committed to writtings; Is that which the preſent* Poſſeſſor *being preſſed to the laſt, recurreth to. Ergo,* The preſent Poſſeſſor had diſcourſe immediate *mouth* to *mouth* with a Prince in many ages back e're the *preſent* Poſſeſſor was born.

This he, And then as if he had done ſome notable feat he falls a roaring, inſulting and mocking his adverſary, ſaying, *Theſe muſt be admirable fellows,* &c. Their ſtrongeſt argument ſerve only to prove the Authors to be in a *Paroxiſm* of folly, moving laughter in a very *Heraclitus.*

But it ſeems our Author hath been in a *Paroxiſm* of *madneſs* and *blaſphemy,* for his Simile can conclude nothing leſs then this, *Viz. That Chriſt is dead, the Spirit of Chriſt is dead, ages out of mind,* that no man *beareth his voice now, nor can recur to him to be ſatisfied of his doubts,* that *he hath broken all his promiſes to his Church, of being with them to the end of the World, of ſending the Comforter to teach them and lead them into all truth, and that great promiſe he that is with you ſhall be in you;* Many more are the promiſſes in the *Old Teſtament,* as in *Jeremiah, Joel,* and

that

that in *Isaiah* 54. 13. *All thy Children shall be taught of the* LORD, Teſtified unto, as fulfilled in 1 *John* 2. 20, 27. If the *Preaching* and *Printing* ſuch groſs blaſphemy as theſe, which naturally, and unavoidably flow from this ſimile, be fit to move laughter, and not rather terror and aſtoniſhment in the Author, let the Reader judge.

I ſhall here add two Arguments fit for this place.

Firſt, Chriſts Sheep hear his voice.

But the *Presbyterian Clergy* hear not his voice.

Ergo, They are not of his Sheep.

Secondly, Where there *is no Viſion, there the people periſh.*

But among the *Presbyterian Clergie*, there is no viſion.

Ergo, Their people periſh.

But bleſſed be the LORD we know and believe according to the Scriptures, That *Chriſt our Prince* is not dead ages out of mind, but liveth and Reigneth for ever, and that he is Faithful and True, and that he is alwayes preſent with his Church, that he ſtandeth at the door of their heart and knocketh; if any open to him, he entereth; and that he dwelleth in them and walketh in them, and is to

them

them a GOD, and they to him a people, and that if any be otherwayes minded he will even reveal this also unto them *Phil.* 3. 15. So let our Author glory in his Charter, which we have as well as he, but be warr to *blaſphem* the Spirit of Chriſt, leſt the end thereof be no laughter, but weeping and gnaſhing of teeth.

His *Second anſwer* is, By diſtinguiſhing *immediate objective Revelation*, granting it was *Immediate* and *objective* in reſpect of the Apoſtles and Prophets, but not in reſpect of the preſent profeſſors of Chriſtianity.

Anſwer, *Firſt*, he here maketh *See his page* 33. the ground and foundation of the *Faith* of the prophets and Apoſtles one thing, and that of the preſent profeſſors of Chriſtianity another thing which is abſurd. *Secondly* he excludes all Chriſtians from *Immediat Objective Revelation*, except Prophets and Apoſtles, & therefore among them the ſeventy Diſciples, and *Luke* who wrote two books of the *New Teſtament*, and many others mentioned in the *Acts of the Apoſtles*; But *Thirdly*, The foundation of Faith, as well as the Rule of Faith hath ſtill been the ſame in all ages of the Church, as he hath formerly confeſſed, and therefore if

immediate

immediate objective Revelation was ſo to the Prophets and Apoſtles (as he granteth) it muſt alſo be the ſame to the preſent profeſſors of Chriſtianity, and this ſhall ſuffice for his *Membrum negatum*.

In *page* 124. He falls upon the laſt argument he deals with calling it the chief of his *Apoſtolik Arguments* (tho I find no ſuch argument in all *R: B*'s apologie, which he ſetteth down thus; *Enoch, Noah, Abraham*, and ſome others, had *Immediate objective Revelation*, therefore the whole Church had it. He and his Brother *John Brown* deny the conſequence, but hath he not hereby cut his own throat, by giving way to Tradition, as the Rule of that Church faith, for ſure they had no Scripture, and therefore had no other foundation for their Faith, nor Rule for their life but Tradition; And ſo having pleaded before, that what was their Rule muſt be ours, he muſt confeſs that in default of Scripture and *Revelation*, there remains nothing for them but *Tradition*, which muſt continue to be our Rule alſo; For this the *Papiſts owe him thanks.*

A little after, he confeſſes there was more of GOD in theſe dark times of the Old World, then there is now, *Viz.* In reſpect of *Immediate Revelation*. But

But I would know the Reason of this, Seeing the *Promises* are greater, even to *pour out his Spirit upon all flesh*; is his hand shortned or his Ear heavier? Or is he dead, (as our Author insinuats) or hath he left off to care for his Church? No, But our iniquities have separated him from us, and our unbelief.

But to do his Business fully, he adds, *How will he prove that ever Abel had Immediat Objective Revelations?* I *Answer*, GOD hath alwayes communicated as much of himself to the Righteous as to the wicked, but wicked *Cain* had *Immediat Objective Revelations*, *Ergo*, Righteous *Abell* had them.

Then he tells us that the third, fourth, and fifth Proposition of the second *Thesis* falls to the ground; But upon what ground he saith so, let the candid Reader Judge.

He concluds this Chapter with a peece of his first Dream of the *Trojan Warr*, and citing *Virgil*, he tells us, like the *Trojan Warr*, its couplings being cut, the whole Fabrick of *Quakerism* tumbleth down about the Ears of its Authors and Builders. It's a pitty the poor man should have read this Poets and others on the History of *Troy*; For the Reader may see how he extravages upon

upon that Subject, it hath quite ſpoiled him. But he hath been a little miſtaken here, for *Patroclus* did not live to ſee the *Trojan* Tower fall; And if he will ſtretch the Allegory a little further, he may remember that the Poſterity of the *Trojans*, brought the Poſterity of the *Greeks* under their ſubjection, and made them Tributaries, which may happen to be the fate of this Author and his Brethren. But ſure I am, this Language is more like a Gallant bowling over his Cups in a Tavern, then a ſober Chriſtian writting for the ſatisfaction of a Diſſenter.

Chap-

Chapter III.

Of Original Sin.

IN this Chapter he begins with his old clamour of *Pelagianism*; But how deservedly, we shall see anone. And first, *I shall cite the Westminster Confession, Chap: 6. Numb:* 2. "By this sin, they fell from their "Original Righteousness, and Communion with GOD, & so became dead in sin, "& wholly defilled in all the faculties & "parts of Soul and Body. And *Numb:* 4. "From this *original corruption*, whereby we "are utterly indisposed, disabled, & made "opposite to all Good, & wholly inclined to all evil, do proceed all actual Transgressions. To both these I willingly assent, But how this agreeth with the *dark Lantern* doctrine of our Author (who for twenty eight pages together in the foregoing Chapter, hath laboured with all the force he hath, to prove that fallen man retained such a portion of the Image of GOD (which he calleth Righteousness) as there-

by

by to know one *Infinite, Omnipotent* GOD, who is to be *Loved, Feared,* and *Adored,* and that men ſhould *Love their Neighbour as themſelves,* which is no more then to do to others as they would be done by) let the Reader Judge. And I expect his Brethren will take notice of him not only for calumniating us, but for giving the Lie to the *Weſtminſter Confeſſion.*

And here I muſt take notice of a word he hath inſerted into ſome of his Arguments, malicioufly inſinuating, That we ſaid, *A wicked man could do no Action that was good upon the matter, or as to the ſubſtance of that Action*: This is no word of ours, but foiſted in by him to render us the more odious. For we know a wicked man may feed the hungry, or cloath the naked; And as I told him before, *The devil confeſſed Chriſt before Men to be the Holy One of* GOD; Which as to the ſubſtance of the Action, was better then ſome of our *Presbyterian Solemnities*; Whereof one was their ſolemn Faſt and Humiliation for the Prevalency of EPISCOPACIE, appointed for all the Miniſters of the Nation immediatly after their late Re-Eſtabliſhment; By which act they reſolved to murther the Conſciences of their Brethren of the

EPIS-

EPISCOPAL *Perswasion*, who esteem EPISCOPACIE a Right and Lawful Church Government; And after this, for some other pretence to have turned them out of their Livings, which is their Lives; Many of them being so poor, as they cannot subsist without them; Which they had certainly done, if their beloved **Reformers** the **Rabble**, had been as obedient in the *North* as they were in the *West*.

Now we read of a desperat *Millanoise*, who *having forced his Adversary for fear of his Life to blaspheme and abjure* GOD, *immediatly killed him, calling it a noble revenge to murther both Soul and Body at once.* Let our Author make the Application, and forbear his malicious Fastings, and black mouth'd Calumnies for the future.

Moreover the grois Doctrines of *Pelagius* were, *First, That man had no loss by* Adam, *and so were as apt from their birth to serve* GOD *as* Adam *was before the Fall. Secondly, That men have no absolute need of Grace, of Love, and the Gift of the Holy Spirit: Only it did facilitat, or make the work the easier, but Man by his nature could do good without Grace.* Thirdly, He affirmed all the *Grace* was at best *Objective*, such as the *Outward Preach-*

Preaching of the Goſpel, &c. But he denyed any *Subjective* Grace, or any Grace that moved or enclined the Will immediatly unto GOD. All which we renounce, And therefore let our Author and his Brethren be for ever hereafter ſilent of that falſe and unjuſt Calumny of *Pelagianiſm*.

Having thus cleared the Truth of the falſe Acculation of *Pelagianiſm*, I find nothing more of weight in this Chapter, but his indeavours to prove that *Infants* are condemned for *Adams* ſin, upon which he acknowledgeth their Doctrine of Reprobation depends, I ſhall offer him the thoughts and arguments of ſome *Proteſtants* upon this ſubject, and then take notice of his argumentations.

And *Firſt*, the learned *Jeremy Taylour* in his book called *Unum neceſſarium*, denyeth this *Presbyterian Doctrine*, and reaſon thus; Either *Adam was condemned eternally, and is now ſuffering in hell for that tranſgreſſion, or he was pardoned, and is now a Glorified Saint*: the firſt he ſaith, *no Chriſtian will alledge Adam being a Tipe of Chriſt*, and alſo *that GOD entered into a new Covenant with him*: So that he *was not condemned for that ſin*; And if the ſecond be true, that is, that *he*

was pardoned, and is now a *glorified Saint*; How then can these men be so wickedly audacious as to charge the Infinitly Just and Merciful GOD with such cruelty and injustice as the wickedest of men would be ashamed of? To wit, to pardon the Malefactor (yea put him in a better condition then he was before) for his transgression, and yet to punish his Posterity (innocent Infants) who had no being till five Thousand years after, who never had accession, nor so much as a consent to that sin, and yet upon this wrong and wicked notion of the Deity depends their doctrine of Reprobation.

Secondly, There is no remission without repentance (saith the former Author) and alledgeth he never yet met with the man, that could say *he had Repented for Adams sin*, and I doubt if our Author will say *it* either, for Repentance is either to be understood, *Penitentiam agere*, *to do penance*, or *resipiscere*, to grow *wise again*, or to *do so no more*, let our Author chuse which of the two he will, and tell us with the next whether he hath repented for *Adams* sin.

Thirdly, It is the Soul that sinneth or is guilty of sin which (according to themselves) we have not from *Adam* but from GOD

GOD by new creation, who made never any thing impure, and therefore I will expect something next from this learned man concerning the *Soul*, *Quid & unde*, for I acknowledge they are little enough cleared yet by the Learned, tho I think our Country man *Barron* is inferior to none I have yet seen; But if our author be for *preexistance*, will more easily give us a reason for our inclinations to evil.

The next I shall cite is the forenamed *John Humphery* with *R: Baxters* approbation, who asserts page 26 of *Eelection & Redemption*, that a discharge of mankind " from damnation for *Adams* sin only is a " fruit of Christs death immediate and " Universal.

Again in page 28, of the Covenant he asserts 'that Infants being Baptised are saved, And adds if they be not Baptised we 'are yet to look on them as such who have 'not broken this new Law, or never refused and rejected their remedy, and so long 'as by the *Redemption* of Christ they are delivered over with all the World from the 'Covenant of *works* to the *New Law* to be 'judged,' I will not be the man that shall condemn one Infant to Hell, or unto torments; And here I must tell our Author

that

that its ſtrange to ſee him contend ſo much for the Scripture to be his Rule, and yet be ſo dogmatical in a matter ſo lubricous, when he can produce no plain Scripture for it, nor a conſequence without exceſſive ſtraining, and whereas he objecteth ſome *Proteſtants*, and ſome Fathers, I had rather with one *Athanaſius* believe the *Divinity of Chriſt*, and wonder that the whole world was become *Arrian*, then follow the multitude in ſuch a groſs error as that was and is.

In the next place I ſhall conſider where the ſtrength of his Arguments ly, rather then follow his rambling, for I perceive he makes the greateſt noiſe and clamour when he hath leaſt to ſay, and boaſteth greatly when he hath done nothing.

The whole ſtrength of this Chapter lyeth in two *Hypotheſes*, *Firſt*, that *If Adam had not ſinned, he ſhould have been Immortal. Secondly*, that as the *Righteouſneſs of Chriſt is imputed to man for Juſtification*; *So Adams ſin is imputed to man for Condemnation.* And to prove theſe two Doctrines upon which much of the *Presbyterian Religion* depends, he ſhould have proceeded candidly, and given us Scripture proofs obvious to every well diſpoſed intelect, whereas he hath

brought

brought no Scripture which any plain man like me can think to relate to such a matter.

First, He calleth R: B: ridiculous, for enquiring *if his Adversary would assert every thing that Augustine said*: But he should have confessed, that *Augustine* erred in this very Matter, in saying, *That all Infants dying without Baptism were damned*; And then have told us, That he who erred in one thing might have erred in the other, But this (tho true) would have wronged his Cause.

His first Argument he draws from *Gen.* 2. 17. *For in the day thou eatest thou shalt surely die*: Hence he argues, *Infants die*; *Ergo*, they are guilty of *Original sin*. This Consequence is very gross, for if bodily death had been hereby threatned, Then *Adam* could not have lived one day after the commission of that sin, whereas he lived some hundreds of years after it: And the *Westminster Confession* is wiser then to make it a part of *Adams* punishment in all the first five Paragraphs of it, till they joyn actuall sin with it, calling it only a death in sin, and a defilement or corruption of our whole nature. But he pleads death is an evil, and no evil could have

befallen man if he had not sinned; This he answereth himself confessing, *That to the Saints, where the sting of death is taken away, it is no evil*: Therefore, if *Adam* had not sinned, death had been no evil to him.

But I must ask him a Question, seeing it is confessed by all, that Eternal death is a punishment of sin, from which the Saints are freed: How comes it that the Saints are not freed from bodily death also? Seeing, according to our Author, *Bodily death is no less a punishment of sin then Eternal Death is.* If he say, That all Mankind were to die because of *Adams* sin, altho all Mankind were not to be condemned for it, (which yet is nothing but his own assertion) How came it that *Enoch* and *Elias* dyed not, but were translated? And that *Paul* saith, *We shall not all die, but we shall all be changed*, &c. All which seems to bear that the Earth should not have been Eternal, nor *Adam* have lived Eternally on it, altho he had not sinned: Which being the grand Pillar, upon which he builds his Doctrines of *Original sin* and *Reprobation*, he should have proven by plain Scripture or sound Reason, which he hath not done to the satisfaction of

any

any Reader, yea he hath ſcarce attempted it except by a Rapſody of railling words: But he had an eaſier way to have proven both, and more conſonant to his own Principles, By telling us, *That it was foreordained from Eternity, that Adam ſhould ſin; and that all Mankind ſhould die, and that the far greater part of them ſhould be reprobates, and be damned eternally*: For the *Weſtminſter Catechiſm* ſaith, *GOD for his own Glory, hath foreordained whatſoever comes to paſs*; But all theſe things comes to paſs; *Ergo*, GOD for his own Glory hath foreordained them.

His next is *Rom: 6. 23. The wages of ſin is death.* Where, ſaith he, *Death without exception of any kind of death, is called the wages of ſin.*

If the Apoſtle had meant more kinds of Deaths then one, it is like he would have ſaid, deaths in the plural number; But the Apoſtle intends here no other kind of death then the ſame kind of Life he mentions in the ſame ſentence, which is Eternal; The words are, *For the wages of ſin is death, But the Gift of GOD is Eternal Life, through Jeſus Chriſt our LORD.* Now to cauſe the *firſt* ſpeak of bodily death, and the *laſt* of Eternall Life, is ſo ſtrained an

Interpretation, as might nauſeat a Reader. He would mock R: B: for ſaying, *The whole Creation ſuffered a decay for Adams ſin*, But it ſeems he hath forgotten, that GOD curſed the Earth for mans ſake, and yet the Earth was not guilty of Mans ſin; But ſaith he, *The body ſhall after the reſurrection live as well as the Soul, and therefore bodily death is a puniſhment of ſin.* This is pretty ſingular, for it is acknowledged by all, that the body is a meer Inſtrument to the Soul; And at this rate, our Anthors Pen is guilty of all the Lies and blaſphemies in his book, and *Patroclus* Swordguilty of the blood of all the *Trojans* he killed; But proves nothing that bodily death was here meant by the Apoſtle, yea he confeſſeth that bodily death is not a puniſhment to believers, ſeing the ſting thereof is removed by Chriſt.

Now are we come to his ſecond Argument I ſpoke of, To wit, *That as we are juſtified by the Righteouſneſs imputed to us, So Infants are damned by the ſin of Adam imputed to them.* So that if the firſt be falſe in the *Presbyterian* ſenſe, the laſt is alſo falſe.

I ſhall firſt tell him what *J: Humphrey* ſaith of it, *Treatiſe of Juſtification, page* 21. " As for what they add uſually (ſaith he)

" in

" in the definition that Christ's Righte-
" ousnels is imputed to us, and made
" ours by Faith as an Instrument; I must
" confess they are notions, which as they
" never came into the head of Saint *Au-*
" *gustine*, nor were received (I suppose)
" into the Church till within a Centurie
" or two of years since, so do I question,
" whether a Centurie or two more,
" may not wear them quite away again.
Again, page 25. If the Righteousnels of Christ be imputed to us (as it it were ours in its self) it must be the Righteousnels of his active or passive Obedience or both; If his active Obedience be imputed to us, then we must be lookt upon in him as such who have committed no sin, nor omitted any Duty; And then what need will there be of *Christs Death*, How shall Christ die for our sins, if we be lookt upon in Christ as having none at all? If Christs passive Obedience be imputed, then must we be lookt upon as such, who in Christ have suffered and satisfied the Law, and born the full curse of it; And then how shall there be room for any Pardon? The Man who paves his full debt by himself or Surity, can in no sense be forgiven by his Creditor. If Christs

active and passive Obedience both are imputed, then must GOD be made to deal with Man according to the *Covenant of works* in the business of Justification, when nothing is more aparent in Scripture, then that by Grace we are Justified, and by Grace saved.

A little after he saith, *There was no need to bring in this notion of Christs imputed Righteousness into the Church*, But that our *Protestants* mistake themselves, and forget that we are justified and saved by the *Covenant of Grace*, and not by the Law of *Moses* or Covenant of our Creation; And in the foregoing page, he saith, *I would* " *fain know whether any of the Disciples, James,* " *John, or Paul himself*, whether *Clement,* " *Roman, or Alexanderin, Justine Martyr,* " *Cyprian, Ambrose, Augustine* or any of " the Fathers, *Whether Counsels or Schools* " *men, whether John Huss or Wickliff, or a-* " *ny Father or Holy writer* (without resting on some bare incoherent scraps of " sentences) did ever understand or receive the full notion of Faiths instrumentality, and the imputation of a passive Righteousness before *Luther?* " And, if not, whether it be possible it " should be of any such moment as is

" made

made of it by most *Protestants* I have set down these that the Reader may see we are not alone in this matter, but that as good *Protestants* as the *Presbyterians*, yea and some of themselves (to wit, *Baxter*) are of the same mind with us; And yet in *page* 1349 he is so confident of this his new notion unknown (as this man saith) to the Apostles, Fathers, Counsels, and *first Protestants* that he asserteth, either *Adams* sin to be such as by it all have sinned, and by it death without exception is brought upon all mankind, or else that the Spirit of God speaketh nonsence in this Text. Certainly the Apostles were plain men, and had more plain simple and less intricat thoughts of the Christian Doctrines then our School-men have devised, and I believe few of them would have understood their terms of Art now in vogue, and if the Apostles, or rather the Spirit of GOD had intended any such Doctrine as necessary to our Salvation; It would not have needed *Heathenish Philosophie* and *Logick* to have strained a consequence from the Text, which perhaps the writer never intended; and our School-mens seeking to cause the Doctrine of Christ quadrate with *Heathenish Philosophie* hath

been

been the bane of *Christianity*, tho it be now made no less then absolutely necessary to the being of a Minister; And yet for all, this man is so confident, let the Reader but look to the 16 Verse of the Chapter, where the comparison is made, and he will see that condemnation or Eternal death is meant, and not bodily Death. His other Argument, *that Death Reigned from Adam to Moses*, can prove nothing for bodily Death hath Reigned from *Adam* to *Patroches*, and what then? *Ergo*, Infants are condemned for *Adams* sin, for none can die but sinners, this is boldly to begg the question and no more.

His great Argument in *page* 135 is, That sin which is described to us by the Apostle, that he saith, *brought Death upon all men, that men sinned by it, and were made sinners, even they who could not as yet actually sin*, that they all became guilty *of Death and Condemnation, That sin by imputation is the sin of the whole nature included in Adam, and rendereth the whole nature obnoxious to death and condemnation; But the first sin of Adam is thus described to us by the Apostle*, &c. *Ergo, that sin is the sin of nature*,

Answer, The *Major* containeth many great lies in it, and the *Minor* is a gross untruth

truth, which he and all the *Presbyterians* in the World can never prove from the words of the Apostles rightly understood, tho indeed they have a faculty of causing the Scripture speak contraries, as we have seen and heard at *Aberdeen*; upon the Text, *Holiness becomes thy house, O LORD*, &c. I shall therefore insert one sentence more of *J: H:* "There are some apt to "conceive only that *Adam* being the root of "Mankind, Humane nature it self sinned "in him, and so when we come to exist "his guilt is derived upon our persons as "virtually and seminally in him, no other-"wise then *Levi* is said to have payed tythes "to *Melchisedeck* in the Loins of *Abraham*. I "should (saith he) incline to this explana-"tion, but that I see not then why all the sins "of *Adam* besides, & of all our Progenitors, "should not be ours also upon the same ac-"count, as much as that first transgression.

He rails at *R: B:* for denying the *Major* of this argument, and telling *John Brown* how he had abused the Scriptures, foisting in words of his own to deceive the simple Reader; I desire the Reader may be at the pains to see *R: B's vindication* and then judge betwixt him and his adversary.

In

In *page* 136 he reproacheth *R: B:* for saying, *shew me the place of Scripture that saith Infants are guilty of Adams sin.* But it would have wronged the cause to tell why *R: B:* said so, which was because *J: Brown* had challenged him for adding an interpretation, tho he told him it was so, and therfore he saith, *I am content there be neither addition nor so much as consequence made use of,* adding let him shew me the place of Scripture that saith *Infants are guilty of Adams sin:* and now I intreat the Reader to compare the Books, and see what candor, integrity, or honesty is among such adversaries, or what Justice we can expect from men of such forcheads, as can raise a calumny on such a foundation, which themselves gave first ground for. He talks abundantly about the Salvation of Infants but to no purpose, forging Blasphemous consequences, and Fathering them upon *R: B:* while they are his own if they be Blasphemies, For he never said, that *Infants are not saved by Christ only,* and hath sufficiently cleared himself in his *Vindication* from this, but repeated calumny.

To *R: B's* saying, *Infants are under no Law,* he answereth in three instances, *that Chil-*

dren

dren are forefaulted and deprived of their Fathers Eſtate for their Fathers faults; 2, That the Children of *Sodom*, &c. And of *Core*, and of *Achan*, &c. *Were puniſhed for their Fathers ſins*; But its ſtrange with what confidence he can repeat theſe tales which *R: B:* hath ſo fully anſwered, and it is manifeſt they ſuffered not for *Adams ſin* (if they were at all puniſhed for ſin) it muſt needs be the ſin of their immediat Parents: And in the very words of *Auſtuſtine*, cited by himſelf in page 141) he ſaith, *ſhall they ſin that are under no command*, That is, *under no Law*. He would abuſe R: B: as ſaying, *Auguſtine did not think Infants guilty of original ſin*, Whereas he only citeth *Auguſtine* to prove they are under no Law, which the words plainly import.

His *Third* is a very rare one, Thus, *If in any point of Religion and Faith, the admirable depth of the Judgement and ſecret Counſel of GOD be to be ſeen, certainly it is to be obſerved here*, &c. I would fain learn from this Author, what worſe the Faith and Chriſtian Religion would have been, tho this contravery of Infants being condemned for *Adams* ſin (while *Adam* himſelf was pardoned) had never been ſtarted in the

Church

Church by such capricious Clergiemen as our Author? Or does he believe that the belief of this Doctrine is absolutely necessary to Salvation? Certainly if it be so, the number will be few, and somewhat more few then *Shepherd* makes them in his *Sincere Convert*. But he saith, *The depth of the secret Counsel of GOD is to be seen and observed here*: If seen and observed here, then it is no secret, and if it be secret, it is no where seen nor observed: But the *Presbyterians* pretend to know the *secret Counsel of GOD*, and yet deny the *Revelation* of his *Spirit*; This is unaccountable Doctrine. But he sends us to *Paul*'s Sanctuary, *Who are thou*, &c. If he had added the rest of the Doctrine he asserts, *To wit*, Who dare deny, That GOD condemneth innocent Infants, for that sin he hath pardoned to the Transgressour, he had come off faitly.

But he answers *Paul*'s Question, saying, we answer therefore. *First*, That *Adam was a publick person, standing and falling in the room of his Posterity, in whose name and behalf the Covenant of works was made with him, as their Representative; So that his first sin was not personal, but the sin of the whole Nature.*

I wonder whence our Author hath gathered

thered all this Stuff, for in all the Scriptures there is no such Doctrine to be found; And he denys any other Means of Knowledge; And therefore upon good ground I repeat it, as R: B: hath done. But he should have proved, that the Nature of the Covenant of works was on this wise; That altho *Adam* died by the breach of it, yet he should be pardoned, yea, and put in a better Condition then he was before the fall; But his innocent Posterity, even Infants, who never had accession to that sin, not had a being for some thousands of years after the same, should be condemned Eternally to hell fire for that first sin: And till he prove this he saith nothing to the Contraversy.

But he labours to prove, *That Adam ceased to be a publick person after the fall; Because he died in the day he did eat, and so became dead in Law.* What strained Consequences are these? Did not *Adam* live again the same day? And was he not a publick person in the *Second Covenant* made with him the same day? Or was there any other Man then on the Earth to make a Covenant with? Or was not the Remission of that sin through the promised Seed Jesus Christ, of as large an extent as the sin was?

was? That as *Adam* the Transgressour was not condemned eternally for that sin, So neither was any of his Posterity condemned for that sin only. Which I have shewed before to be the mind of as good *Protestants* as our Author.

To prove that for *Adams one sin only, all Mankind are condemned*, he giveth us a *Philosophick Axiom, Bonum ex integra causa, malum ex quolibet defectu*: And citeth *Isaiah*, 53. 31. But he should have told us in what verse of this Chapter it is said, *That Christ suffered for Adams sin*, For I find not such thing in it; But our sins, our Transgressions, our Iniquities; *We all as sheep have gone astray; We have turned every one to his own way; and the LORD hath laid on him the Iniquities of us all*; And therefore he will do well with the next, to give us Scripture, for proving this unscriptural *Dogma*, of the damnation of Infants for *Adams* sin; Or else acknowledge that the belief of it is not necessary to Salvation; And certainly if it be necessary, the Scriptures will be sufficient to prove it; Tho our Author be pleased to call our saying so an *Antiscriptural dottage*: His words concerning *Augustine* I have told him before, were cited by R. B. to prove

that

that Infants are under no Law; Which he waveth, and deceitfully insinuateth, that R. B. cited these words to make *Augustine* say, *That Infants are not guilty of Adams sin*; Which he never intended further then the words bear; To wit, *That they are under no Law*; Yet our Author defends *Augustine* in condemning Infants; And again cannot chuse but condemn *Augustine* for saying, *That Infants dying without Baptism are condemned*; So he owneth *Augustine* when he pleaseth him, and rejecteth him when he displeaseth him. In the end of page 141, He gloryeth a little upon his false Insinuation, which only manifests his deceit and folly, as is his ordinary Custome.

In *page* 142, He returns to prove that *Infants are under a Law*, which he acknowledgeth cannot be found in Scripture in so many words, but may be gathered (by a *Presbyterian Commentator*) from the 13 and 14 verses of *Romans* 5. *For until the Law sin was in the world, but sin is not imputed where there is no Law; Nevertheless Death reigned from Adam to Moses: even over them who had not sinned after the similitude of Adams transgression, who is the figure of him that was to come.* Now let the unbyassed

Reader

Reader judge whether any word here can infer that infants are under a Law, or are condemned for *Adams* sin? To prove this, he saith, *Infants die, and the death here mentioned is a bodily death, and Death is a punishment of sin*, and refers us to his former Section already answered. But *R: B:* saith it may rather signifie that which *Paul* cals a body of Death, and is often called Death and Old *Adam*, and flesh, and the Law in the members, by which corruption of mans nature, Mankind is made obnoxious to fall under the temptations of Satan, and is naturally inclined to evil, as *R B:* hath described at large in his *Vind: page* 57, which he slily, or rather deceitfully passeth by, and then cryeth out, a *Pelagian* exposition, as if *R: B:* had said that men sinned only by imitation, then which he could hardly have devised a greater lie, and I intreat the Reader to see the page now cited, and consider what faith these men can deserve. And as to the compatison betwixt *Adam* and Christ in *R: B:* his *Apologie*, and again in his *Vind: page* 58, he sayes they are not to be regared, because they are to be acounted among the grossest *Socinians* who make the the Death and sufferings of

of Christ an occasion, or example only, &c. But not at all the procuring cause of Salvation. This needs no other answer but this, *Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy Brother*, and I hope we should know our own Faith better then this lieing Priest.

His next to prove Infants guilty of *Adams* sin is, *Ephes.* 2. 3. The words are, *Among whom we all also had our conversation in times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh, and of the mind, and were by nature the Children of wrath as well as others.*

Who is he that reads this verse and seeth not, that it mentions actual sins? And that by nature is understood that corrupted nature which hath brought forth these forenamed transgressions; But that any word here can intimate that Infants are condemned for *Adams* sin is a wild consequence; He saith, *if the Apostle had meant otherwayes he would have excepted Infants*, But he might as well have said he meant no such thing as the damnation of Infants, because he hath no where asserted it; But to prove that by nature is meant original sin, he citeth some Scriptures but so impertinently, as a man might think he

dreamed, *Gal:* 2. 5, and 4. 8. 1 *Cor:* 15 44, 46, *&c.* Which the Reader may ſee and conſider his citation of *Calvin*, he might have ſpared his pains, and if *R: B* paſſed by them, it was becauſe they were not worth his while, and ſo his concluſion reſolves in Wind.

Next he gives us a whole page of *Auguſtine* and ſome others againſt the *Pelagians*, and what then? Will he own all that theſe men have written, but he tells us of fourteen *Biſhops*, and therefore I muſt ask him whether theſe fourteen *Biſhops* were *Limbs* of *Antichriſt* as our *Biſhops* uſe to be called? Or if a *Biſhop* can be a good Chriſtian?

His next is, *Pſalm* 51. 5. *I was ſhapen in iniquity, and in ſin did my Mother Conceive me.* Saith he *R: B:* denyeth the inference which yet is clear from *Nehemiah* 9: But hath not been ſo honeſt as to tell the verſe, and I can find no ſuch thing there except in the 2 verſe, whether it is ſaid they *Confeſſed their ſins, and the iniquities of their Fathers*, and ſo throughout the whole Chapter, but no mention of *Adams* tranſgreſſion. What he ſaith of the Marriage duty is moſt impertinent, except he can ſay that *Davids* Parents had no ſin, except

it

it were the marriage duty, which I think no *Presbyterian* will assert: But he thinks he hath done a brave fate in asking, when his adversary readeth of *actual sin*, because *R. B.* asketh him in what Scripture *he readeth of Original sin*, but he may find if he will, that he shall receive according to the deeds done in the Body, whether good or evil. And 1 *John* 3. 8. *He that committeth sin is of the Devil*, and *John* 8. 34. *He that committeth sin is the servant of sin*, and many more. Let him bring as plain Scripture that Infants are condemned for *Adams* sin, and he hath done this business.

In page 146, He offers us several pregnant arguments (as he words it) to demonstrate his Doctrine, as first *Infants are deprived of the Image of GOD*, therefore they are guilty of *Adams* sin, he proves his consequence, because to be deprived of the *Image of GOD* is a punishment equal with, if not greater then the torments of hell.

But our Author hath mistaken all his measures here; For if it be a punishment to be deprived of that which a man never had, then it is a punishment for *Patrocles* to want the *Bishoprick* of *St. Andrews* (so called) that it was a punishment to *Adam* who

who once had it, I deny not, but he cannot prove that Infants had it, and so cannot be deprived of it.

His next is, *None go to Heaven except those that were guilty persons, therefore Infants who have never committed actual sin are guilty before GOD. None are saved but sinners, which was Christs errand to the Earth*, &c. And such like trash of *John Browns*, fully answered by *R: E: page* 60 and 61. He at last resolves all into a Question, *How infants if not guilty to come to Heaven without the death and merits of Christ*? What he intends by this Question is hard to be understood, its much if he knows what he sayes, for we never said nor believed that any person, Infants, or Old man came to Heaven without the Death and Merits of Christ; So that his Question if it have any sense at all, must be, what need have Infants of Christ if they be not sinners, nor guilty of *Adams* sin? This is answered by *R: E: page* 61. They have need of Christ who died for them, as a Saviour to deliver them from the seed of sin, and corruption in them, which is called death, and the *Old man*, that they may put off this, and sing the song of the Redeemed, as *John Brown* words it: But how

of

r by what means he doth this he hath not told us, and I desire not to be wise above what is revealed. His answer to Q. 3. Question, *how elect Infants come to be saved, whom he accounts guilty of Adams sin*, is, by the imputed Righteousness of Christ. But then, what becomes of the Instrumentality of Faith, without which they deny imputation, let him help this lame answer with the next.

His next is, "These who in the sight of "GOD are dogs, are guilty persons to be "excluded from Heaven, and therefore "to be cast into hell, but whole Nations "without exception are such, therefore "Infants being a part of these Nations, "deserve to be excluded from Heaven "and sent unto hell." To prove his Minor he bringeth *Matt.* 15. 26. *It is not meet to take the Children's bread and cast it to dogs*, but it seems he hath forgotten to look unto the 28 Verse. *O Woman! Great is thy Faith*, &c. And if they be dogs, who have Faith, yea and great faith; I must ask him who are Children? And if such who have great Faith deserve to be excluded from heaven, and sent to hell? He might have considered that many of the *Gentiles* who formerly wallowed in the lusts

lusts of the Flesh, and were dogs came afterwards to be washed from their polutions, and that *Publicans* and sinners entered the Kingdom of Heaven when such professing *Scribes* and *Pharisies* as our Author were shut out. The other place he citeth 1 Cor. 7. 14. *For the unbeliesving husband is Sanctified by the wife, and the unbeliesving wife is Sanctified by the Husband*, else were your Children unclean, but now are they holy. If this be any thing to the purpose, it is against our Author, seeing it relates to the uncleanness and holiness of the immediate Parents, and can never be thought to intend *Adams* sin, but any thing may serve to make a Muster.

His next is *Gen.* 17. 14. *The man Child that is Uncircumcised shall be cut off.* Hence he saith that Mr. *Brown* inferreth that *Children may be in some sense capable of breach of Covenant*, and therefore under a Law, desiring his adversary to chaw his Cude upon it. *First*, I observe how timorously they propose this argument with a *may be*, and *in some sense*. But it is strange how men pretending to sense could propone in it, for whose sin was it if the Child was uncircumcised? Could it Circumcise it self or could it desire another to do it? Or did

did ever the Juſt and Merciful GOD require ſuch an impoſſibility of an Infant of eight dayes old? It was therefore the Father and not the Child who was oblidged by this Covenant, and who ſinned in caſe of *Non-performance*; So that *R: B:* needed not trouble himſelf with ſuch nonſenſical ſtuff.

His fourth pregnant Argument is, *John* 3. *None can enter into the Kingdom of Heaven except they be born again*: Upon this he argueth, the *New Birth* is a Gift of GOD, which he may withhold from whom he will; And therefore without prejudice to his Juſtice, may exclude whoſoever hath it not from the Kingdom of Heaven; But none are excluded from it but guilty perſons, which I believe none will deny. Therefore Infants may well be accounted guilty perſons. I anſwer in ſhort, when he tells us how his Elect Infants are born again, he may take the ſame way with the reſt; For I have told him before, I pretend not to be wiſe above what is revealed; But his Doctrine of *Imputation* will not ſerve his turn here.

Laſtly, He comes to anſwer that of *Ezek:* 18. 20. For which he bringeth no anſwer; But tells us Mr. *Brown* hath cleared this

this Text; Why then did he meddle with it? But he sayes it contradicteth the *second Commandment.* *Answer*, No such matter, for the *second Commandment* saith, *Visiting the sins of the Fathers upon the Children* &c: Which is generally expounded of Temporary punishments, and relates to the immediat Parents; But *Ezekiel* saith, *The Soul that sinneth it shall die*, which is meaned of Eternal punishments.

And now to conclude, I must ask this great Pretender to a knowledge of the secret Counsel of GOD, and the state of Infants after death; Whether they shall continue Infants, and be such every way at the Resurection and to all Eternity, as they are the time of their decease? And I shall expect his answer with the next.

Chap-

Chapter IV.

Of GOD.

HE begins this Chapter with three malicious and falſe Acculations, according to his cuſtome, ſaying in this Chapter, *I ſhall prove the Quakers guilty of three things*, each of which is enough to Un-Chriſtian the Maintainer thereof; But I hope not the Denyer thereof.

His three things are,

Firſt, *That they deny the Holy Trinity with Arrius and Sabellius.*

Secondly, *That their Doctrine maketh GOD the author of ſin.*

Thirdly, *That they hold the Soul of Man to be GOD.*

All which three we poſitively deny our ſelves to be guilty of, and I hope all ſober and unprejudiced Men will acknowledge, *that we know what we believe* better then this our *deceitful and malicious Enemie* doth: And therefore this whole Chapter needeth

no

no other Answer. But *the LORD rebuke this lying spirit that is gone forth into the mouths of these lying Prophets*. Who take pleasure to defame and bespatter innocent Men, thereby to lay them open to the fury of their bigotted Admirers, and blind folded followers. But the just GOD who searcheth our Hearts knoweth our Innocency, and will in due time rip off these covers of deceit, and take away this refuge of Lies, wherewith these Men cover themselves, that they may hurt the Innocent.

To begin with the first, R: B: in his Apologie, *George Keith* in his Book of *The Way cast up*, have so fully vindicated us from the *Arrians* and *Sabellian heresies*, that I wonder with what face this Author can accuse us; And it is evident to all single hearted Men who read our Writings, that it is the Words only we oppose; *To wit*, words invented by the *deformers* of *Christianity*, the *Clergie*, who by their heathenish philosophie (by a new name called *School Divinity*) have invented and brought into the Church these heathenish and unscriptural terms which we reject. Nevertheless, this perverse and malicious Author, like an Advocat pleading at a Barr, Bawls, Cryes,

Cryes, Rants, and Tears, and will *perfas & nefas*, have us guilty of *Arrianism*.

And first he sets down that *Arrian* heresie to be, *That the Son is separated from, or divided from the Eternal and Ineffable Substance of GOD the Father.*

Now I charge him and all the *Presbyterians* in the World to produce on sentence in our Writings, bearing this Doctrine, which I am sure they cannot. Moreover *Philip Melanchton* in *Chron: Carionis*, page 264. Saith, That *Arrius* denyed the *Divinity* of *Christ*, and *That the Son was Co-Eternal with the Father, that he was a Creature ex non existentibus*, That is *ex nihilo*, All which we detest and abhor.

But to stop his mouth for ever, I tell him we owne the *Nicen Creed*, which I shall here insert so farr as concerns this Contraversy.

" I believe in one LORD JESUS " CHRIST the only begotten Son of " GOD, born of the Father before all " Ages; GOD of *God*, Light of light, " True GOD of true *God*, Begotten not " made, Consubstantial with the Father, " by whom all things were made, who " for us Men, and for our Salvation

" came

" came down from Heaven, and was In-
" carnat of the Holy Ghost, and the
" Virgin *Mary*, and became Man, was
" also crucified for us, suffered under
" *Pontius Pilate*, was buried and arose a-
" gain the third day, according to the
" Scriptures, he ascended to Heaven, sit-
" teth at the Right Hand of the Father,
" and is to come again with Glory to
" judge the Quick and the Dead, of
" whose Kingdom there shall be no
" end.

And now what can our most malicious Adversaries require more of us, for I hope it is evident to all Men, that it is the words of Mans Wildom invented, that we oppose and not the Mystery it self.

And here by the way I must tell him, that this Counsel hath been no friend to *Presbytery*; For we read of no *Presbyters* there, but such as were *Legati* sent by *Bishops*, who for age or sickness could not come; As also, that they appointed two *Metropolitan Bishops*, one in *Rome* and another in *Alexandria*, See *Chron: Carions*, page 265.

The rest of his Tatle is only about the Translation of *Hebr:* 1. 3. For which he citeth a number of *Lexicons*, I have none of

of them by me, but one *Screvellius*, who in his *Lexicon Græco Latinum* tranſlats it *Perſona*, and in his *Lexcon Latino Græcum* tranſlats it *Subſtantia*: But *Hierom*, *Eraſmus* and *Melanchton* tranſlats it *Subſtantia*: And ſo if *George Keith* have ſaid any thing which offends our Author, in this or any other point, he may deall with his Books when he hath a mind, and I do not Queſtion his ability to anſwer for himſelf.

I cannot omit one notable proof he gives to prove his falſehoods; Thus, *It is moſt evident from their perpetual belliſh railings at the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity, calling it an abominable and ſtinking Doctrine, as they that heard them told me*, &c.

Now Reader conſider, what can be expected from ſuch an Adverſary, whoſe malice blinds him that he cannot ſee his own folly? Perhaps as grea: a Liar as himſelf told him a Tale, and he will print and publiſh it to the World, to defame an Honeſt and Innocent Body of People; This is *Hicks* and *Faldo* downright.

As for the Word *Perſona*, it is not to be found in the *Nicen Creed*, and not only *Auguſtine*, but *Jerom*, and *Laurentius Valla*, find fault with it, as no fit word to expreſs

press the Mystery: But a late Writter who calls himself a *Protestant Minister*, *Poiret cogit: rationales de DEO*, &c: disputeth at large against the word *Persona*, to whom I referr our Author.

That it is an unscriptural word, he confesseth, and then why may we not seek plain Scripture for it, as well as his Brother *Jo: Brown*, in page 175, saith, *It is considerable, that no where in Scripture we find it affirmed expresly, that Christ died for all Men.* why then is all this trouble made? But it seems *Presbyterians* may do many things, which are not allowable to others, seeing they would fain be accounted Dictators over all Consciences in *Brittan*. But I hope what is said will suffice to clear us of *Arrianism* to any prejudiced Reader: And therefore I shall proceed to his second Calumny.

Which is, *That according to the Quakers doctrine*, GOD *is Author of sin.*

We have heard of some Witches, who after they were condemned, have impeached many Innocent Persons: So our Author being unable to clear his Brethren of that guilt charged justly on them by R: B: and fully proven, would have the *Quakers* as guilty as they, *Solatium est*

miseris

miseris multos habere pares, But two Blacks make not a White.

His Argument is, GOD *is the Author of every Substance.*

But according to the *Quakers*, *sin is a substance*, *Ergo*, &c.

He proves his *Minor* thus, *Grace is a Substance*, *therefore sin is a substance.*

He saith R: B: denyeth the Consequence, which he thus proveth.

" Sin can hear feel and perceive as well " as Grace and Light, it may feel and " perceive the things of Satan as well as " Light. And Grace feels or perceives " the Things of GOD, and may be in " the Heart of a real Godly person, " Therefore it is a Substance. Thus our Author.

Answer, The Scripture is cleat, *That the Life of the Son of GOD is the light of men*, and that this is a substance I think he will not dare to deny, and he hath seemed to grant that there was a substantial life in *Adam* before the fall, which he saith was extinguished by the fall; Hence came the darkness, the Death, the Polution, the Corruption, the lust, the flesh, or Body of Death, and all sin as the *West-minster Confession* teacheth. Now to compare these

to

together, and to say the light enlighteneth, therefore the darkness enlighteneth, the life of Christ in man feeleth and perceiveth, therefore Death, Polution and Corruption doth feell and perceive, is a most wild consequence, and if he intend to make the seed of the Serpent every way equal to the *seed of the Woman*, its but the path way to *Manichism*, and indeed he hath manifested his favour to the Serpents seed very much, by contending so warmly for its Kingdom in his Chapter of perfection. But it will not do, for no Man can deny, that he hath had the Counsels, Prohibitions, Approbations and Reproofs of the Light and Grace of GOD, either before or after the doing of the Good or evil act, which speak forth a living and substantial Principle; Whereas the other is a meer defect, privation, weakness, corruption, and a want; And hath more of the nature of an accident (tho I dare not call it one) That is, which may be present or absent without destroying its Subject; For *Adam* had no sin, and was better without it then with it; And so will our Author if ever he have the good Luck to be delivered from it (tho contrary to his Faith) And Christ the best

Man

Man that ever, was never had it, as he ſaith, *The Prince of this World commeth and hath nothing in me*; But his mightieſt argument is the laſt, which he builds upon his own weak judgement thus: "For I judge this "to be the reaſon why the *Quakers* judge "that this is the reaſon (it ſeems the man "hath loſt both ſenſe and reaſon) that "there being grace in the hearts of wick-"ed men, while in their wickedneſs "proveth it to be a ſubſtance; *Viz.* Be-"cauſe it can be where its contrary is, "and ſtrive, and wreſtle with it, which "is as evident concerning ſin in the heart "of a Godly man.

Anſwer, If *Patroclus* had lived till *Ariſtotles* time, ſurely he had learned his *Logicks* better, but he had the ill hap to meet with *Hector* before *Ariſtotle* was born; And for as great enemies as we are to *Logick* in our Authors eſteem and account. I muſt tell him this judgement and reaſon of his hath loſt his cauſe: For *Ariſtotle* ſaith (with other *Logicians*) *Subſtantiæ contrarium eſt nihil*, and *Subſtantia Subſtantiæ non contrariatur*; So that if the light be a ſubſtance, its contrary is nothing: And this may give a *Specimen* of this windie mans learning, as we have many of his honeſty; All this is

but *George Meldrums* Dicats to the Students at *Aberdeen*, put in a new dreſs, and fully anſwered in *Quakeriſm Confirmed*, *Sect*: 4.

He is very angry with *George Keith* for ſaying, *The Devil may be called ſin by a metonomie*, but he might have remembered that *Paul* calls *ſin a body of Death*, *the Old man*, *the fleſh*, *and Old Adam*, all which are figurative ſpeeches; Yet he calls *George Keith* a rediculous Babler, he is not the firſt babler who hath reproached him, and this is all the fair dealing we can expect.

He alſo compleans that *GergeKeith* ſayes, *that to query a thing will not conclude*, *that the Queſtioniſt doth poſitively affirm or deny what is queried*, which the Author will find true in the query, I have propoſed to him in the end of the laſt Chapter, where I neither deny nor affirm the thing queried. In concluſion, he will have *George Keith*, and the *Queriſts*, to ſay, *that the Devil is Original ſin*, whether he will or not, I ſhall ſet down the Querie.

What is *Original ſin?* Whether it be not the devil: For doth not Original ſignifie the beginning?

Now he hath ſpent two whole pages of his book full of abuſive language upon this

this query, ſtill affirming that the Queriſts affirmed hereby the *devil to be Original ſin*, which he can never prove from the Query; For why may not an Unſcripturall word (as Original ſin is) be examined, as to its meaning, without affirming or denying any thing concerning it? *That the devil was & is the Original of all ſin*, I think our Author will not deny: But to ſay, *that GOD made him ſo*, is his blaſphemous inſinuation, and none of ours, and therefore his concluſion is his own.

But how affrontedly impudent this poor man is, and how his malice hath blinded him, is evident here, where he ſpendeth two whole pages of his Book, aſſerting *that to query a thing is to affirm it*, and for denying this, he calls his Adverſaries *pitiful*, *purpoſeleſs*; *wranglers*, and their diſcourſe *nonſenſical niceties*, and calls *George Keith* a fool, a knave, and what not, while in page 208 of his book he betakes himſelf to the refuge for defence of his Brother *J: B:* ſaying, he *only enquireth*, and a little after ſaith, the contrary of which, for any thing I can learn he ſuppoſeth; So that according to this Author, a *Quakers Query* is an *aſſertion*, and a *Presbyterian Query* is a flat denyal, at leſt a

ſuppoſing the contrary; But theſe Prieſts are Holy men, and Holy men like Holy writ muſt be read backward, but he knows he is accountable to none but his Brethren in *Prima inſtantia*, for his Doctine, as was anſwered by them to King *James* the ſixth, when he accuſed *Blackie* for preaching at *Andrews*, **That all Kings were the devils bairns**; Who are not like to cenſure him for traducing the *Quakers*.

His third Calumny is, *That we hold the Soul of man to be GOD*; To prove this, he citeth two Authors, *Hubbertborn* and *George Fox*; Theſe books I never ſaw, only I find that *William Penn* hath been aſſaulted with the latter, by our Authors beloved *Anabaptiſt Hicks*, and hath ſo fully anſwered it, that our Author might have taken notice of it if he had minded to be ingenuous, he may find it in *Counterfit Chriſtian*, page 68, 69, 70, and 71. But admit all he alledgeth were true (as it is a moſt hateful lie) that theſe two men had believed and written ſo. Was there either honeſty or fair dealing in our Author to charge this on a whole body of People, who had publickly denyed any ſuch Doctrine to be intended by the Writers, or owned

by

by them as *William Pen* hath done in the place before cited, If I upon the *Presbyterian Eloquence* ſhould accuſe the whole Body of the *Presbyterians*, of the Blaſpemies and Abſurdities therein charged on particular perſons; Who would be readier to blame me then this Author? who upon *Hicks* and *Faldos* Teſtimonies hath publiſhed (it's like) theſe Citations, Or ſhould I cite here ſome *Presbyterian* Authors, Saying, " This Diſcipline is no " ſmall part of the Goſpel, it is the Sub- " ſtance of it: And this Diſcipline is the " Goſpel of the Kingdom of GOD: And " this Diſcipline is the Eternal Counſel " of GOD. The Authors I will not name, except he put me to it, becauſe I am not of the mind that any ſober *Presbyterian* will owne ſuch Doctrines: But I expect no ſuch fair Dealling from our Author, who cannot but know himſelf to be a falſe accuſer, if he but ſeriouſly read, and conſidered the Books he hath cited in his pamphlet.

Therefore to ſatisfie all men, who may have occaſion to ſee this, I do hereby for my ſelf, and in the name of my Friends declare, *That we believe the Rational Soul of Man which joyned with the Body, conſtitutes*

him a Man, and distinguisheth him from beasts, to be a [redacted]*e Creature created by GOD, and that it is neither* GOD, *nor any part of* GOD. And this I hope will satisfie all unprejudiced Readers, and demonstrate the malice and deceit of this our furious Adversary. And with this one Declaration of our faith in this Article, all his Cant for eight pages together falls to the ground; Which being chiefly stuffed with *Macquairs Rhetorick*, deserves no other answer but, to tell him, I am not so well skilled in the art of Scolding as he.

I shall here only intreat the Reader to take notice of what he saith concerning R: B: in the end of page 172, and the beginning of the next, and to compare this with R: B's *Vindication* page 190 and 191; That he may see what cause he hath to boast of his *Anabaptist Auxilary*, and to call R: B: ridiculous. He is pleased to call *William Penn* a *Saducee*, a *Papist*, and a *Pagan*, but leaves the probation of it till he write next. As for the words *Spiraculum Vitarum*, he tells us of three or four *Lexicographers*, upon whose skill of the Language his faith depends: But *William Penn* tells him of *Rabbi Nahmunni*, *Hiskuni* and *P: Fagius*; And as I told him before, *R: Bark-*

Barkelay told him of *Athanaſius* and *Gallus Alexandrinus*; whoſe Authority is as good as his *Lexico-graphers*, if not better; And therefore we muſt expect better proofs next.

His laſt Citation in page 176, is nothing to his purpoſe, except that any thing which he thinks can blaken the *Quakers*, is pertinent enough. But I muſt ask him here, doth he allow of *Henry Forſides* Anſwer, To wit, Being asked, For what end Chriſt wept over *Jeruſalem*? He Anſwered; *As he was humane he mourned, and his God-head decreed them to hell:* If thou oweſt this anſwer, thou and he are the Blaſphemers, in aſſerting a will in Chriſt as Man, contrary to the Will of GOD, for no Man mourns for what he deſires, and delights in; But certainly Chriſt as Man, delighted in fulfiling the Decrees of GOD.

But the words he carps at are, *The Eternal tendered over them*: This he calls a ſubjecting that moſt pure and impaſſible Being, to the weakeſt Frailties of Mankind; Poor Man! Doth not the Scripture ſay, *That it repented the Lord that he had made Man, and it grieved him at his Heart*, Gen: 6. 6.

And

And Eph: 4. 30. *Grieve not the Good Spirit of* GOD.

Chapter V.

Of *CHRIST* and His Benefits.

OUR Author begins this Chapter with his ordinary Ingenuity, as he ended the last, Saying, *The Quakers in words ordinarly acknowledge, that Christ is GOD and Man.* Yea *Patroclus*, and in Write too, if thou could learn to write the Truth; But saith he, *They maintain a Spiritual and Heavenly Nature in Christ, which they call the Heavenly Man, which did exist before the Incarnation of Christ, and assert that on the Flesh and Blood of this Man, the Church in all ages did feed.* Then he giveth us a bundle of Citations out of *George Keiths* Book, *The way cast up*, But never one of the Scripture Arguments which he bring-

the

eth to prove theſe aſſertions: Which ſheweth evidently that they have been too hot for his Fingers: This is not like the Champion *Patroclus*; And he might have conſidered that *George Keith* was a Philoſopher, and therefore might have allowed us one Caſuiſt, and have diſcuſſed him before they had charged his Doctrines upon us: But he tells us, it is a clear Conſequence of this Doctrine, that Chriſt hath three Natures, and addeth, To this they Anſwer, *Quak: Confeſſion* page 33. *That it will no more follow from their Doctrine, that Chriſt hath three Natures, then it will follow from ours, who aſſert that Chriſt aſſumed into Union with the Divine Nature, a Body and a Soul.*

But with no better Candour hath he cited this place, then his Brother *Hicks* and *Faldo* uſed to; I ſhall therefore ſet down the words. " But if they argue " that at leaſt Chriſt hath three Natures " in himſelf; We ſay, their own Prin- " ciple will conclude that as much as " ours, For the God-head is one Nature; " The Nature of the Soul is a ſecond; " And the Nature of the Body is the " third. And our Adverſaries themſelves " teach, That as GOD is three Perſons

" in

" in one Nature, So Christ is three Na-
" tures in one Person.

Who seeth not here that our Author hath disingenuously skipt over the strength of the answer, to wit, the latter part of it, which is an argume nt, *ad hominem*, and that themselves are owners of that which they would make an absurdity in others; But if he have leasure he may read the *Cantabridgian Philosopher*, *H: More* concerning the *Astral* bodies of men: For which I find him not censured by any, as making men to be Monsters, and so you may allow *George Keith* some latitude in such Metaphisical stuff, however he is of *Age*, and can answer for himself.

His next is in page 179, where he chargeth us with quite anihilating and destroying the Divinity of Christ, for which he citeth a book of one *Christopher Aitkinson* in the time of *Oliver Cromwel*; But I ask him, hath he this book? Or hath he taken it upon trust? Or found it folding up wares in some Grosers Shop? For my part I never saw this book, nor know I if there be such a book Extant in this World, but he hath had two sufficient answers, the first, that *C: Aitkinson* was not a *Quaker*, the *Second*, if he deny Christ to be a man

we

we disown him who do say, that Christ is both GOD and Man. And here let the Reader observe, that *J: Brown* thought this a good answer to *R: B:* as is to be seen, *Vind:* page 67: But our Author will hear no such thing, and affirmeth in page 181; That this confession serveth only to prove us guilty of the most wicked Hypocrisie, lieing and self-contradiction to put a cheat upon the World, and cover our abominations, to prove this heap of gross and unworthy calumnies, he betakes himself to *George Keiths* book again, and the places before cited, quite ommitting (as before) all the arguments used by *George Keith*, and never offering us one argument to prove his false accusations of Hypocrisie, lieing and false accusation, but proceeds like a scolding Kail-wife, reeling and roaring like a drunken man, foaming out his own shame; But he saith, *these Doctrines of George Keiths destroy* all the arguments for proving the Divinity of Christ, of which he mentioneth one; *By him all things were Created.* But was the power of the *Logos* lessened by taking that Flesh of the *Virgin*? And was he not as able to have Created the World after his Incarnation and Assumption of that Body,

as

as he was from Eternity? And then what did his being the Heavenly Man, the first-born of every Creature hinder the *Logos* from Creating the World, and all things therein? As for his *Ubiquity*, *George Keith* hath aboundantly cleared himself in the Book before cited, to which I refer him, and shall now come to his *Dilemma*, which is this.

" If all things were created by Christ as " Man, Then either the Manhood of " Christ is Created or not? If Created, " then it is Created by it self, then which " there is nothing more absurd, it Uncre- " ated, then there is an uncreated Man, " and a Man that is Coeternal with " GOD.

Answer, The fallacie of this *Dilemma* lyeth in the first supposition, and is obvious to a very mean understanding; To wit, *If all things were Created as Man*, This was never asserted by *George Keith*, as his own words cited by this impudent Author will easily prove, page 93; *The Word made Flesh Created all things.* Now except he will say, that he was weakened or disabled by assuming a Body, he can make nothing of his *Delemma*, for he was still and is, and will be for ever the same *Eternal* and

Omnipotent

Omnipotent GOD as well as Man. If he ask who made that Heavenly Body? I answer The same *GOD Almighty* who made the Body which he took of the *Virgin*, and so his Consequence of an *Uncreated Man*, *Coeternal with GOD* is a meer fancie, For *George Keith* calls the Heavenly Man, the *First Born of every Creature*, as the Apostle also doeth, and never asserted that he was Man from all Eternity.

I need not trouble further about G: K: they having promised a full answer to the Book, and I think he will hardly refuse to enter the Lists with this *Grecian Hero*; But I shall give a citation to chaw his Cude upon, (as he words it) and so leave this matter, *Melan: Chron: Car: page* 274, citeth *Socrates Scholasticus* for three Cannons of the Counsel of *Syrinum*, The second of which is,

Si quis eum Jacob, non filium, tanquam hominem Colluctatum esse dixerit, sed non genitum Deum, aut Patrem Deum, Anathema sit.

After his *Dilemma*, and a little railing, Telling we are worse then *Arrians* or *Socinians*, and such like stuff, not worthy to be transcribed; He at last falls upon the Light, calling it a *meer chymerical None-entity*; Seeing there is nothing more contradic-

tory

tory then that either the Soul or the Body of a Man can be every where, or from Eternity.

That it was from Eternity, is his falſe Alledgiance, and none of our Aſſertions: And for its *Ubiquity*, he may ſee *Quak. confirmed*, in the place before cited; That the *Seed* and *Life* is in *Him* in the *fullneſs*, as in the *fountain* or *ſpring*, but in *us*, as the *ſtreams*; in *Him* as the *Head*, in *us* as the *members*; And as the *Light* is principally in the Body of the *Sun*, yet diffuſeth it ſelf through the whole world; Even ſo the *Light* of Chriſt the *Sun of Righteouſneſs*. As for his Relicts of the *Image of GOD in Adam* that quenched ſpunk of his Extinguiſhed Lantern, he might have left it alone for any Advantage he made by it laſt.

In the beginning of page 83. He takes a very ſingular fitt of Railling and Lying, He ſayes, in favours of this *Spiritual Antichriſt* or *Antichriſtian Figment*, *which they account for their Chriſt*; *They decry, vilifie, and do what they can to overthrow whatever ought to be dear and precious to a Chriſtian (for what will they not deny, ſeeing they deny the Godhead of Chriſt) They therefore with open mouth*

blaſ-

blaſphem and deny Jeſus Chriſt as a Perſon without them, &c.

What will this Man ſtick to aſſert, who after ſo many accounts of our Faith in this matter, can with an hardned face, and (I may ſay) a ſeared Conſcience aſſert ſuch groſs untruths; For which I wiſh the LORD may grant him Repentance. But as the Poet ſaith, — *Nam quis innocens erit, quis triſtiore liberabitur nota, ſi criminare ſufficit?* I hope the World hath learned by a long Experience, that a *Clergie Man* is not alwayes to be truſted (I had almoſt ſaid ſeldom) when he turns accuſer of the Brethren.

But to amuſe or rather abuſe his Reader, he gives us a bundle of Citations, upon the Authority of his Friend *Mr. Hicks*, (as he calls him) ſo fully anſwered in the very places cited by him, and our Doctrine fully cleared in this matter; That if the man had not been paſt all ſhame, he would not have dared to revive the Dottages of that defated Forger: Who durſt not again attempt to anſwer for himſelf. But this Authors impudence muſt be more then ordinary, who hath throughout his whole Pamphlet been crying out againſt us, as one both with

Ana-

Anabaptists and *Socinians*, whom in page 89, he calls wicked and abominable; And yet in this place he takes them for his fellow Souldiers against the *Quakers*: This is certainly as bad, as to receive the *Mallignants* into the Army: Yet common to the *Chieff Priests*, *Scribes* and *Pharisees* in former times.

But what is the matter he intends by all these Citations, Namely, *They deny* (saith he) *Jesus Christ as a Person without them, distinct from Christ in them.* For clearing of this matter to all unbyassed persons, I shall state the matter thus;

That Christ is with and in his Saints is a Doctrine, so fully testified to in the Scriptures, that no Christian will deny it, *Matth*: 28. 20. *And lo, I am with you alwayes, even to the end of the World.* Which *Beza* saith is meant, of the manner of the presence of the Spirit, *&c:* But is absent from us in Body. In which Body, we acknowledge him, a Person without the Saints, & distinct from them; As *William Penn* hath told thee, tho thou had the Candour to conceal it, But that Christ the LORD from Heaven, the *Quickning Spirit is one in the Saints*, and another *distinct Person without them*, we

we deny; And such as affirm it make two Christs. See *John* 14. 20, 23. and 15. 4. 5. and 17. 23. *Rom:* 8. 10. 2 *Cor:* 13. 5. *Gal:* 1. 16. *Col:* 1. 27. *Revel:* 3. 20.

But in the end of these Citations, He must have a second hit at *H: Forside.* Is this to tell us again, *That Christ as man hath a will contrary to the will of his God-head?* No, But for saying that the word *Humane* is no Scripture Language, but saith our Author, the thing imported is found in Scripture. He might have minded that the word *Humanus* may be derived from *Humus* the *Earth*, as well as from *Homo:* And that the Body of Christ now in Heaven is an Earthly Body, is a very gross Notion.

Again page 84. He returneth to *Hicks* and *Faldo*, but citeth us no page, running at random: And truly *Patroclus*, this is an easie way of writting Books, if to publish all the Lies and Forgeries devised, and maliciously vented against the *Quakers* be an honest Imployment, thou might have had another Book of that kind written before we noticed this.

I shall only take notice of one of the grossest of them, he nameth *Edward Bil-*

lings, but citeth neither book nor page, to which *George Whitehead* in the Appendix before cited by our Author, ſaith, *it is groſs and blaſphemous to ſay, that the Myſterie of iniquity lyeth in the Blood of Chriſt.*

Now Reader, conſider this Mans honeſty, who but he that would be accounted ſuch himſelf, could adventure his reputation upon ſuch Authority as this? Or would ſpread ſuch impudent calumnies and forgeries after they had been proven ſo fully to be ſuch? certainly it muſt be a bad cauſe that need ſuch Pillars to underprop it; But I intreat thee *Patroclus* for the future, *ſpeak Truth and ſhame the Devil.*

In page 185, he tranſcribes a deal of *Faldo's* ſtuff, alledging we render the *Paſſion, Death, and Reſurrection of our LORD JESUS at* Jeruſalem, *altogether vain and idle actions, and that we call the Body that our LORD took off the Virgin only a Garment, and that it is no conſtituent part of CHRIST.* A heap of groſs and unparaleled lies. To prove all which he citeth *William Pen* his *Rejoynder, part 2. Chap. 9.* Saying thus, *Whereas it is ſaid that it was revealed to* Simon, *that he ſhould not die till he ſhould ſee the LORDS Chriſt, is to be underſtood of a Spiritual ſight, or of ſeeing the Chriſt within.*

Cer-

Certainly, This must be a man of no Credit, nor one that values a good name, tho he begin his Book with it: For if he can produce in that Book or Chapter such an expreſſion of *William Penns*, he ſhall ſurely cauſe Print a new Copie and inſert it; for I aſſure my Reader, there is no ſuch thing, ſo that henceforth our Author deſerves better to be called *Simon* then *Patroclus*; Yea, he out-does *Faldo*, for *Faldo* accuſeth *William Penn* only for ſaying, that *the Body of Jeſus was not the whole intire Chriſt*, Which *Faldo* labouring to prove, and ſometimes deny, (that any man having the uſe of his Reaſon, might have been aſhamed of) he fully bemires himſelf, and yet our Authors citation is more odious.

He cometh now to another falſe charge, ſaying, as theſe men *deny CHRIST Himſelf*; So they *deny conſequently all the benefites purchaſed by him.* *The Father of lies* could ſcarcely have been more audacious, tho perhaps more cunning then to have Printed himſelf a lier; The *Firſt* is proven to be a lie already, let us hear what he ſaith for the *Second*. For this he returns to his trade of forging citations, and gives *William Penns Sandie Foundation ſhaken* 26.

" Thus, Unleſs we become doers of that " Law which Chriſt came not to deſtroy, " but as our example to fulfil, we can ne- " ver be juſtified before GOD; nor let a- " ny fancy that Chriſt ſo fulfilled it for " them, as to exclude their Obedience " from being requiſite to their accept- " ance, but only as their patern, *&c.*

This Thread-bare citation hath been many a time caſt in our teeth, and toſſed over and over to no purpoſe: For *William Penn* hath ſo fully cleared himſelf of it, that no honeſt man would have charged him or us with it, as my Reader may ſee in *Reaſon* againſt *Railing*, page 78, and *Counterfeit Chriſtian detected* from page 22 to page 78, which were too tedious to inſert here, but hath brought an indelible brand of infamy upon *Thomas Hicks*, whereof (it ſeems) our Author covets a ſhare.

In *page* 180, He contemns at the old rate of forgery and falſly accuſing us, firſt of *Socinianiſm*, and then of *Popery*, ſaying, *R: B:* denyeth not that his *Doctrine of Juſtification is all one with that of the Council of Trent*; He citeth for proof of this Calumny *Apol:* page 137, 139, and *Vind:* Sect: 8, N: 9. *Where*, ſaith he, *He accuſeth* Luther, *and*,

and the Body of the Primitive Proteſtants, as great Deprivers of the doctrine of Juſtification, and doers of as great hurt by this their Doctrine, as ever they did good, by what they pulleddown of Babylon.

A groſſer lie, nor a greater forgerie was never Printed in this Age; What ſhall men do when they deal with ſuch audacious ſlanderers? But *Patroelus* tell me ſeriouſly, didſt thou think that any who Read thy book, would be at pains to compare it with the places cited? If they did, how could thou think to eſcape the black Character of an infamous forger? Doth not *R: B:* in both places cited, diſpute largely againſt the *Papiſts*? And in his *Vindication* doth he not challenge *J: Brown* for Patronizing the *Papiſts*? But thy Forgerie is more then manifeſt in the latter part of thy charge; Wherein thou ſayes, he accuſeth the *Proteſtants*, as doers of as great hurt by this their Doctrine as ever they did good by what they pulled down of *Babylon*.

R: B's Words are theſe; For in this, as in moſt other things "~~He~~ [*Luther*] is "more to be commended for what he "pulled down of *Babylon*, then for what he "Built of his own.

Let the Reader from this one citation Judge of our Authors Candor, and whether

ther this perverſion be not wilful as well as malicious.

In the next place, he giveth us a whole page and ſome more of *Hicks* and *Faldo*'s ſtuff ſo fully anſwered, and the Perverſion thereof ſo fully detected by *William Penn*, that the Authors themſelves durſt never attempt their Vindication; But it ſeems our Author thinks theſe of his own ſtamp will believe him implicitly, and the Books he hath forbidden them to read, and ſo thinks himſelf ſecure, but he being manifeſted to be a Forger as above; I hope the Reader will be at the pains to read *William Penns* Book againſt *Hicks* and *Faldo*, where he will find all theſe Citations fully handled, which were ſuperfluous to tranſcribe here.

In the end of page 187. He ſaith, with the like facility I could ſhew, *That the Doctrine of the Quakers is in every point contrary to the Doctrine of Chriſt.*

Truly it is eaſie for a man who loves to make Lies, and makes no Conſcience of ſo doing, to vent and Print them: But what is now ſweet in his mouth, may prove bitter in his belly. But he proceeds, ſaying, I ſhall content my ſelf with one

great

great Inſtance, *Viz: The Reſurrection of the Body, concerning which the Quakers are downright Saducees.*

This is another like the reſt, And to return a lie upon him, I ſhall firſt ſay, *We believe, according to the Scriptures, a Reſurrection of the Dead, of the Juſt and unjuſt*; So that this unjuſt Adverſary here chargeth us very falſly; For we can juſtly ſay, *If in this Life only we have hope in Chriſt, we are of all men moſt miſerable.* Nor were we ever charged with denying the Reſurrection, but only of that ſame *body Niomerical* Concerning which we willingly aſſent to what the Apoſtle hath ſaid, 1 *Cor.* 15 from verſe 35. to the end. And 2. *Cor.* 5. 1. 2, 3. Which *Beza* Interprets of the Reſurrection: And if our Author will be wiſer then the Spirit of GOD, I muſt leave him there, and remit him to cultivate his Reaſon better, by converſing with ſome of the Modern Philoſophers; As *Henry More* and others, and particularly *Kenelm Digby*, in his Obſervations upon *Religio Medici*, page 343. I ſhall offer him only two Sentences of his, Firſt, " All ſublunary Matter, being in a con-" tinual Flux, and in bodies which have " internal Principles of Heat and Motion,

" which continually transpireth out to "make room for the fresh Supplies of new " Aliment; So that in process of time " all is so changed, that the body of the " Young Man is not the same body of the " Old Man, and so one body sinneth and " another suffereth.

Secondly; " That which giveth the *numerical individuation* to a body, is the substantial Form, as long as that remaineth the same, tho the matter be in a continual flux and motion, yet the thing is still the same. It is evident that *Samenes*, *This nes*, and *That nes* belongeth not to matter by it self, but only as it is distinguished and individuated by the Form.

The rest of his Work to the end of this Chapter, being nothing but the foul Vomite of two malicious Forgeries already answered, deserves no answer.

Chap-

Chapter VI.
Of Perfection.

HERE he beginneth with insolent and insulting Language, and then (with more then his usual Candor) sets down R: B's. eight *These*; But lest I should have mistaken him, he returns to his *Priestine* State and Old Principles; Saying, and afterwards he saith, *That there may be a State in this Life, in which a Man cannot sin, it is so natural to him to do Righteousness.*

Tho I be wearied with such Perversions and Paultry stuff; I am inforced to transcribe R: B's. Words to evince yet once more his dissigenuity. *Apol:* page 170. "Lastly tho I affirm that after a Man "hath arrived to such a condition, in "which a man may not sin, he yet may "sin: I will nevertheless not deny, but "there

"there may be a State attainable in this "Life, in which to do Righteouſneſs "may become ſo natural to the regene-"rate Soul, that in the ſtability of this "Condition they cannot ſin; Others "may perhaps ſpeak more certainly of "this State, as having arrived to it: For "me, I ſhall ſpeak modeſtly, as acknow-"ledging my ſelf not to have arrived at "it; Yet (obſerve,) dare not deny it, "for that it ſeems to be ſo poſitively "aſſerted by the Apoſtle, 1 *John* 3. 9. "*He that is born of GOD ſineth not, neither* "*can be, becauſe the Seed of GOD remaineth* "*in him.*

Now let the Reader Judge whether to aſſert be one thing, and not dare to deny be another thing; And the Reaſon our Author gives is, It is ſo natural to him to do Righteouſneſs, Whereas R: B's: Reaſon, why he dare not deny it, is becauſe the Apoſtle ſeems ſo poſitively to aſſert it: But this is not the firſt we have met with.

The next we get is another peece of *Hicks* (one of his wicked abominable *Anabaptiſts* (as he words it) which I intend no more to concern with.

But he tells us R: B: hath given away the

the Cauſe; *Vindi. Sect:* 9. Saying, That he pleadeth for no more then Mr. *Brown* ſaith, *Numb:* 6. To wit, *That by Perfection in this Life, is underſtood a change in the whole Man,* So that he yeildeth *Impartial Obedience to all the Commands of GOD, tho in a ſmall degree.* Thus our Author.

Certainly it's ſtrange what the man could promiſe to himſelf by ſuch baſe and unworthy diſſimulations? For *R: B:* citeth *John Browns* words, page 328. 329. *In regeneration, the whole man is changed, ſo that he is now born a new Creature, ſanctified wholly, in Mind, Heart, Spirit, Affection, Conſcience, Memory, and Body, tho but in a ſmall meaſure or degree, yielding Impartial Obedience (through the Grace of GOD) unto all GODS Precepts waving none.*

Theſe are the Words cited by R. B. and miſerably mancked by our Author, who hath skipped over the moſt matterial parts of his Brothers words, that he may have the more room; but this is a very mean ſubterfuge, and will not long cover him: For, ſaith he, R. B. enquireth, how this Doctrine is reconciled with that of *daily breaking the Commands in thought, Word, and deed?* In anſwer to which queſtion. (ſaith he) It is enough to enquire, *How he evinceth*

evinceth them to be contradictory? Observe Reader, That according to this Man, (for I will not think that his brethren will own him) to be changed in the whole Man, to be born a new Creature, to be wholly sanctified in the mind, heart, Spirit, Affections, Conscience, Memory and Body, *&c.* And to break the Commands daily in thought, word, and Deed, are no wayes contrary, and need no Reconciliation. Behold this Mans Sanctification! And let him tell me with the next, what difference there is betwixt his Holiness or Sanctification, and other Mens wickedness where malice is wanting.

As for that he adds, That the Law of the Lord requireth a perfection of degrees as well as well as parts; He might have known that we are to be judged by the Gospel and not by the Law.

Next he saith, And whereas he enquireth; *If to break Gods Commands daily in Thought, Word, and Deed, be the way to grow in Grace? To put off the Old Man and put on the New?* This he calls a malicious calumny. But who gave the occasion for it? Did not I. B. bring this for a proof, that Men sin daily in thought, Word and deed, *viz.* That Christians are *exhorted*

to

to grow in Grace. To put off the Old Man which is corrupt, to put on the new Man; to mortifie their Members: And now I leave it to the Reader to judge, whether R. B's queſtion were pertinent, and neither malicious nor calumnious? Yet our Candid Author muſt add ſomething that he may ſtill be like himſelf; Asking, Where did any of the Reformed teach, that to endeavour to break *Gods* Commands to grow in Grace, as this Man inſinuates they do? Firſt he hath added the Word (Indeavour) and then he hath fathered the import of I. B's argument upon R. B's queſtion. Is this honeſty? To tell his Adverſary, *His Light teacheth him a faculty of Lying*, while himſelf is both the Lyer and the Forger.

He goeth on to give us I. B's ſecond Proof thus, This perfection renders Goſpel Commands uſeleſs: R. B. Anſwers by a Simile, Asking *Are the Laws uſeleſs if Men obey them?* He anſwers. "He "that is above the Breach of the Law, "hath no more uſe of the Law, or need "of it, to learn any thing from it, in or-"der to his Obedience thereof. Is not this a poor Subterfuge? How ſhall a Man obey the Law, if he know it not? Or how

obey

obey it if he take not heed to order his Converſation according to it? And is then the Law uſeleſs to him? But he might have remembred, that R. B. aſſerted a poſſibility of ſinning, and only modeſtly ſaid, he durſt not deny a further State, becauſe the Apoſtle ſeemed poſitively to aſſert it. But the Apoſtle ſaith, *Againſt ſuch there is no Law*, he may tell us next who theſe are?

But to ſumm up this *Paragraph* he will not only faſten a contradiction upon R. B. but alſo Blaſphemy, ſaying, But that he may further contradict himſelf and his Brethren, He ſaith in his Apologie, that *all have need to repent and pray for forgiveneſs: For* (ſaith our Author) *If ſome be equal with God, above the breach of the Commands, want a body of death, the moſt that they have to do is to give Thanks, and not to pray or repent.*

Is not this a profound as well as fair Diſputant? Did his Adverſary ever ſay, That any were equal with GOD? No: And therefore the Blaſphemy is his own, for which he hath need to repent; And ſo had the beſt Saints, for that all have ſinned, and whoſoever hath ſinned hath need to repent and pray for Forgiveneſs; And if he will conſult the Scriptures he

may

may see that after the Intimation of Pardon, the Saints have mourned, and prayed for Forgiveness: See 2 *Sam.* 12. 13. Compared with *Psalm.* 51. 14. But his Malice blinds him in this and many more things.

He comes now to *John Browns* next proof; *Viz: This doctrine tends to foment Pride and Securitie, and taketh away diligent Watchfulness, Holy fear, Humility,* &c. To which R. B. answers, But where Freedom from Sin is, where can pride and Securitie have place? or Diligence and Humility be wanting? But with him to sin is the way not to be proud and secure, but to be watchfull and humble. For answer he sends to *Rom.* 3. 27. *Where is boasting then? It is excluded, By what Law of Works? Nay, But by the Law of Faith.* But prithee *Parvulus*, what saith this for thee? Are we boasting in our own strength, or in the strength of the Grace of God? Or do we depend upon the Law of Works? No, But on the Law of Faith, which purifieth the heart and worketh by Love. If to exalt the Grace of God as sufficient be to boast in thy Sense, thou hast Liberty to abound in thy own sense, wherein no good Christian will own thee.

But

But he giveth us another citation of R. B's in these words, That according to our Doctrine, *denying the perfection of degrees in this Life*, the wicked Villains do less make useless God commands then others, because they afford more matter to exercise Repentance and Prayer for forgiveness of God.

Will, thou never deal honestly, Did R. B. once mention a *perfection of degrees*? But to I. B's, argument, *That the keeping the Commands of God, takes away the exercise of Repentance, Prayer, &c.* He returns thus, If this his Argument hold true to prove, that Men must sin all their Life-time, and break the Commands every day, in thought, word and deed, then the greatest sinners and most profligate Villains, do less make useless Gods Commands then others, because they afford more matter to exercise Repentance and Prayer for Forgiveness of sins. For answer, he sendeth to *Rom:* 3. 8. *Let us do evil that good may come.* Which saying tho it was falsly and slanderously said of the Apostle; Yet is truly said of him and and his *Brother I. Brown*, who have thus asserted it *in terminis*: By saying, That the

the Keeping of Gods Commands renders the Ordinances of Christ useless.

His very next Words are a gross Lie, saying, And here he promiseth always to cry down the Ordinances of Christ Jesus. R. B's Words are these, "As for such Or-"dinances as must be made useful by day-"ly breaking God's Commands in "Thought, Word and Deed, I resolve "never to cry up, but always to cry down. And here let the Reader take notice of his Blasphemy, who affirms the Ordinances of Christ Jesus to be such. As for his following Question, it is Nonsense: For he, *R. B.* never said that any Ordinance taught in, but that he and his Brother have taught here, That this is the use of their Ordinances (but not of the Ordinances of Christ) is obvious to every Reader.

In the next place we have another of J. B's Proofs, That them *none that are regenerate could sin wilfully, but would be beyond the possibility of it.* For which he cites 1 *John* 3. 9. and Expounds it of a trade and custom of sinning from Malice, like the Devil and the Wicked his Children. And then tells to prove, that Regeneration ad-

T mits

mitteth of no Degrees, but is one instantaneous Act.

To the First, to wit, *J. Brown's* Argument; I say it is a wild Consequence, to conclude from a *posse non peccare*, to a *non posse peccare*: And yet *Calvin* in his *Instit.* citeth *Augustine*, saying, *Adæ fuisse libertatem posse non peccare, nostram vero multo majorem non posse peccare.* And still our Author takes *R. B's* modest Expression, *I dare not deny*, for a full Assertion.

As for his Exposition of 1 *Joh.* 3. 9. of a Trade and Custom of Malice, like the Devil; It is a meer Dream, there being no shadow for it in the Context.

His Doctrine of being *Regenerat in an instant*, contradicts his Brother *John Brown*, *Numb.* 18. who says, *It may be begun, where some Members may yet be to be mortified*: But according to *J. B.* elsewhere, 'the Man is 'wholly sanctified in Mind, Heart, Spirit, 'Affections, Conscience, Memory and Body. Behold Reader, how these our Adversaries reel and stagger like drunken Men!

I shall therefore here give him the Sense of *Augustine*, set down by *J. Brown*, and approven by *R. Baxter* in his Paper of *Confession. pag.* 13. He tells us that *Augustine* in

in this Book, layes some two or three of these Texts together. To wit, "Solomon, "Paul, James, John, and offers us this "Solution: *That which is born of GOD sin-* "neth not, which is as much as to say, "there is that which is born of GOD in "the true Christian; and that which is "not born of him. Where is then the full and compleat Regeneration at one Instant? The two Scriptures *Phil.* 1. 8. and *Gal.* 5. 7. He makes very short work with; Telling us the *Philippians* were Saints in Christ Jesus when this Epistle was written. *Ergo*, they were wholly sanctified, in Mind, Heart, Spirit, &c. As *J. Byrom* saith the Regenerate Man is, And yet breaks the Commands of GOD daily, in Thought, Word, and Deed: To the other place, he saith, It sayes as little for him, from it he would infer the Saints falling away, which is false (sayes he) but I hope he will not deny, that *Paul* was in part regenerate, when he said, *Lest when I have preached the Gospel to others, I my self should be a cast-away.*

He spends page 195, proving *Regeneration to be accomplished at one instant*, not by Scripture, for that fails him here. Only he instanceth two, Saying, I would fain

know, *If the thief on the Cross, and the Jaylor were not born again?* A brave Argument, from a Particular to an Universal. *Peter, James*, and *John*, saw Christ Transfigured, therefore all men did so: *Enoch* & *Elijah* were translated; Therefore all the Saints are so. What he speaks of Children in Christ, *R. B.* grants that they are under a possibility of sinning, and a capacity thereunto; but modestly again in page 120 saith, I dare not affirm, *But that there may be some that cannot sin*, &c.

He proceeds, alledging from 1 *John* 2. 12. That these to whom the Apostle wrote were perfectly Born of GOD, but that Scripture saith no such thing, only *that their sins were forgiven*, which according to himself is the first act of Justification, and proceedeth Sanctification of the whole man (as *J. B.* words it) in mind, heart, &c. And so not perfect Regeneration. But doth this prove that these Children did break dayly the Commands of GOD in thought, word, and deed? That they were perfectly born of GOD he proveth, because (saith he) *They had the seed of GOD, or Unction abiding in them.*

But the Seed before it come to perfection or tobring forth fruit, it requires a time,

and

and I hope our Author will not deny, that the young man mentioned here by the Apostle who had overcome the *Evil one*, were more perfectly and fully Regenerated then the Children, tho the Children were perfect as to their measure. So that it follows not that any of them did break the commands of GOD dayly in thought, word and deed (which only is the matter in debate) no more then it follows, that how soon the seed is in the Womb, it is as perfectly a man, as when it comes to the use of reason.

But seeing he here talks of the Seed of GOD and of the *Unction*, I desire he may inform us by the next, what he intends by these words: Whether a *Substance* or an *accident*, or only the dim spunks of his extinguished Lantern?

His next work is is to prove us *Pelagians*, and remits his Reader to his second Chapter, which I also do. When *R: B:* tells *J: B: that the Fathers he cites thought that men might be free from sin by Grace*; Our Author calls it mancking and clipping, and saith "Is it not added in the very following "words immediatly that none attained "that measure of Holiness in this life, "that he could live any long time with-

"out

"out Sin, and that this perfection was "not full and absolut, but which might "increas, and was mixed with evil deeds, "so was a perfection of parts only not of "degrees", Here these Fathers say, *any long time without sin*, and therefore I must ask our Author of what extant this long time is? I am sure one day is a very short time, and no wayes deserves the word long to be added, and yet if they grant us but one day; The *West-minster* Divines have done with it for ever.

I hope our Author will not accuse *Augustine* of *Pelagianism*, and therefore I must let him see that *Augustine* saith as much as R: B. Also *John Humphry perfection*, page 7, saith *Augustine* in his second Book, Chap: 15. *De Pec: mer: & rem:* and *de Spiritu & Litera*, hath the luck to treat industriously on this matter. *Alia est Quæstio utrum esse possit Homo in hac vita sine peccato, Alia utrum sit? It is one question whether a man can be in this life without sin, and another whether he be so?* For the former Question he distinguisheth of what is possible by Grace, and what is possible by our own strength, to hold that any man by his free will only without Grace is able to keep all GOD's Commandments and be without sin, is that

that Grand *Pelagian* Doctrine, against which he ſets his face, and deteſtes it; But that it is poſſible to attain this by Grace, or the ſpecial aſſiſtance of *GOD's Spirit*, he thinks it beſt it ſeems to grant; He thinks it not fit nor ſafe to ſay, any (nor all) of GOD's Commandements are impoſſible: Beſides, Where GOD Vouchſafs his Grace the work (he pleads) is to be aſcribed unto him, to whom nothing is impoſſible; And I hope this (being all we plead for) will forever aquite us of *Pelagianiſm*, and commpeſce all the ſlanderous tongues of our ignorant and malicious Adverſaries.

As for his *Oroſms*; The firſt is a modeſt ſaying, like that of *R: B:* before mentioned, but the ſecond is a heedleſs expreſſion, *The man that can be without ſin is Chriſt*, from which it would follow, that *Adam* was Chriſt, who could have been without ſin, and once was without it; And I hope there are are ſome now who are clanſed from all their Polutions, waſhed and purged from all their ſins, according to the Scriptures, yet are not Chriſts: But becauſe *R: B:* ſaith it is not his work to meddle with what is ſaid againſt the *Pelagians*, and *Socinians*, he will therefore conclude him a *Pelagian*, and *Socinian*. What

trifling is this? Because our Author will not defend *Mahometism*, and *Judaism*; therefore he is a *Jew* and a *Mahometan*, Is this as good consequence? And yet in such doth our Author delight. But the best is, that he saith, *Nothing that R: B: can say, can be of weight against us*; And why so *Patroclus*? Are *Presbyterians Infallible*, or inaccountable? Or when came they by this priviledge? I thought they had been subject to mistakes as much as other men; And here he turns to the Fathers again: But the Fathers of the three first *Centuries* only are reputed *Orthodox* by *Presbyterians*; And it is clear they fall in with *Papists* there, and have as much need of a *Purgatory* as they.

His Next is to answer this, *Viz. That this Doctrine is against the Wisdom of GOD.* Our Author answereth, Saying, *he only insinuateth that there are means given to the people of GOD, whereby they may be free from all sin, if they use them well*, Adding that he mumbleth *as one in a confused haste*, but our Authors hast is much greater: For R: B: hath write a whole page and more upon this Argument, and our Author does not take notice of six lines of it.

But

But he insinuateth this, "That the "only-wise GOD, A being to gather to "Himself a peculiar People, Holy and "Righteous; And for that Effect sent "His Son into the World to save them "from their sins, and hath given them "his Holy Spirit to sanctifie them "throughout, and to cleanse them from "all sin (as the Scriptures testifie). Now "to say that he cannot compass that end, "is to derogate from the Wisdom of "GOD. But he answers, *This is with great facility denyed; for we say* (saith our Author) *that it is the Will of GOD, that perfect freedom from sin be a property of the Church triumphant only. Sat pro imperio.* He might have left this to the *Pope*. Now for proof of this bold assertion, he saith, *It is enough to challenge him, to give any example of one that is freed from sin in the World, except Jesus Christ, who never had it but by Imputation.*

Thus the Man who tells us, *Affirmanti incumbit probatio*, but he confesseth Infants have no sin but by Imputation. And I would fain know when *Enoch* and *Elijah* were purged? Whether in the World before their Translation, or in the Empereal Heaven, into which they either entered

entered with their sins, or were freed from sin in the World: And if so, he may tell us with the next, how long they were so freed before their Translation, for I can assure him they had no need of *Purgatory*.

To *R: B's.* alledging from *J: B's.* words, That he confessed there was some *material service performed to the* DEVIL; He answereth, This objection militats as much against the Apostle, Saying, *Rom: 7. That with his flesh he served the law of sin.* For answer to which, I remitt him to the 17 and 20 verses of the same Chapter; Neither hath he yet proven that *Paul* speaks here of his present State, as the second verse of the next Chapter doth evince. That this Instance will overdo, he is mistaken, upon his begging the Question, that the best and most gracious Action of the Saints are tainted with sin, which we must take his word for.

His next is, *That it is the Will of GOD, that his People be under a warefare so long as they are here.* To which *R: B:* answers, But is it the Will GOD, that they be alwayes overcome: After this he adds his own words in stead of his Adversaries, according to his Jugling Custome: But

ler

let us hear his Answer, He saith, *They are not alwayes overcome.* What? Is not daily while they are in this Life alwayes? If to break the Commands of GOD daily, in thought, word and deed, as long as they live, be not alwayes, he may tell us the difference next. But, saith he, *They alwayes overcome at the end of the Warrs.* I must expect a Paraphrase upon this Text, when this Warr endeth, and whether it be in *Time* or *Eternity?* Or if he will allow the Saints one day to live after their Victory; For *Paul* seems to intimate that he had fought the Good Fight, and had finished before his dissolution.

To *R: B's:* affirming that this Doctrine is injurious to the Sacrifice of Christ: After his brothers Evasion he giveth us his Answer in two parts. First, *If* (saith he) *he were a mind to make a difference betwixt HEAVEN and Earth, he had not made a Question about full Victory in this Life.* Then it seems he thinks the Victory must only be after this Life, and in *Purgatory*; For no unclean thing can enter the Kingdom: Let his brethren judge of this Doctrine; For as the Tree falleth so it lyeth.

His second Answer is, *How profane a heart must he have, that accounts all the attainments*

ments of a Child of GOD in this Life, are good for nothing, For notwithstanding of them all, he will still have the Sacrifice of Christ to be useless, except a Man in this Life become as sinless as an Angel: Thus he

But what a profane heart must he have who will not part with his sins and pollutions one day in all his Lifetime, altho Christ came to save him from them and not in them? And that the Sacrifice of Christ was sufficient to purge him from the stain as well as the guilt, I think he will not deny: And that Christ requireth not impossibilities, but giveth strength to obey these Precepts, *Be ye Holy, Be ye Perfect*, I think every Christian will acknowledge, and so the fault lyeth still in his profane heart, which chuseth his pollutions, and will not part with them.

How R. B. hath answered his Brothers eight Chapter. He refers to his Reader, and so do I: In the next place he most disingenuously representeth R. B. as saying, "That there is no difference betwixt him "that sinneth through malice, and him "that sinneth through infirmity, And "asketh, is there no difference, that the "one repenteth and the other not?

All this stuff is largely answerd by R. B.

page

page 123. But what doth he intend by Repentance? The word must either be taken for *pœnitentiam agere*, *to do penance* (according to the *Papists*) Or for *Resipiscere*, That is, *to grow wise again*; Or *to do no more so*; In the first sense I think our Author will not take it; And in the second sense, 'tis quite another thing, then to break the Commands of GOD daily in thought, word, and deed; For he who truly repenteth becomes a hater of sin, and a doer of Righteousness.

To R. B's argument, *That their doctrine makes the Ministry useless*, he giveth three Answers of R. B's sufficiently replyed to by R. *B*: But let us hear them, First; *Upon their very head the necessity of a Ministry appeareth*. Upon what head? To tell us that GOD's Commands are impossible, and that it is folly to attempt the keeping of them. For no man since the Fall, by any Grace received in this Life, is able to keep them, but doth daily break them in thought, word, and deed. His second Answer is, *That it cannot be proved, that this is the Ultimate end of the Ministry mentioned* Ephes. 4. 13. *is attained here*. This Answer confirms R. B's Argument, For according to their own Opinion. *Frustra fit multi-*

dium

dicere, quod nunquam obtinere potest finem suum. That is, *In vain is that means which can never attain its end.* His third, Of a perfection of Parts and Degrees, is frivolous. For R. B. never denyed a growth in Holiness.

For his putting of a cleansing *from sin till the other Life.* He saith nothing for it, but his own bare assertion. And it is obvious to any Reader, that the Apostle to the *Ephesians* 4. and 5. Chapters, is speaking of the Conversations of the Saints in this Life; Which I desire my Reader to consider, where he will find this Subterfuge of our Author fully manifested to be nought.

In his next, he is no less disingenuous; He (R. B.) saith, it will not follow from *Col.* 4. 12, 13. and 1 *Thes.* 3. 12. *That it is impossible that Men should be free from Sin here by the Grace of GOD.* Whereas he hath first rebuked I. B. for commenting upon these Texts, which he tells him are in themselves as plain as can be; And yet tho I. B's Commentary were admitted, His Doctrine would not follow. Hence the Reader may see this Mans pith (as he words it) and how hard shift he makes to escape at any door, how unworthy soever;

But

But that the two Texts stand firm against him is evident, for if to encrease & abound in Love, to abound in Holiness, and to stand perfect and compleat in all the Will of GOD, can consist with the breaking the Commands of GOD daily in thought, word, and deed, I confess I know nothing of such Commentaries, nor shall ever desire to learn such Contradictions.

To R. B's Question, How *these can be said to have renounced the works of darkness, who have need to be washed from dark defilements.* He answereth, let him read the 12, and 13, of *Zachariach* and there he may find that there two are consistent. But *Patroclus* I can find no such thing there, I find mention of a Fountain *opened for sin and uncleaness*, but there is no word of daily here; I find also a refining as silver is refined, and trying as gold is try'd, but not every day, for after that he saith, *They shall call on my Name, and I will hear them,* (*But GOD heareth not sinners*) I will say it is my people, and they shall say, The LORD is my GOD; And if this be to be sinning daily, and Washing daily, let the Reader judge. And yet this is all that concerns his matter in these two Chapters.

He ends this paragraph with a gross lie, saying

saying, *For we know the* Quakers *and* Jesuites *have an inveterate hate against all* Protestants, *yet in a special manner their hate burneth against the* Presbyterians, *knowing that these are farthest off from the Church of* Rome. This *Patrocinium* is indeed *Amicum Testimonium*. And I assure thee, few *Protestants* hereaway believe it. Thousands of *Protestants* know that we love and honour them, and will trust more to our plain honest Simplicity, then to the pharisaical pretences of a *Presbyterian priest*; It seems our Author converseth with few Men who dare avow their Sentiments of *Presbytry*, or loves best to heat *Sycophants*; For in this Countrey there is little difference thought to be betwixt a *bigotted Jesuite* and a *Jesuited Presbyterian Priest*, except a few *Principles*, *Creeds*, and *Confessions*; Both being acted in their practices by the same proud, pragmatical, imperious, and persecuting Spirit. As for the *Laity* so called among the *Presbyterians*, we love them, and also the persons of the Clergie; But we regrat that the people should be so hood-winked and led blindfold by this Covetous and Ambitious Generation, who seek themselves, and neither the Glory of God, nor the Welfare of the people. We hate no man, knowing

but he who hates his Brother is a Murtherer, and no Murtherer hath Eternal Life abiding in him.

To the Examples of *Enoch* and *Noah* being called perfect; He saith, R: B: *confesseth they once had sin*: Therefore, how came they at another time to be free of it altogether; The answer is easie, 1 *John* 1. 9. *If we confess our sins, He is Faithful and Just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness.* As for the word Perfection its having diverse significations, It may be so: But I am sure it can never be truely predicated of him who breaks the Commands of GOD daily, in Thought, Word, and Deed.

He comes next to vindicate their Arguments, for the **Devils Kingdom**, or **Sinning Term of Life**: The first whereof is, 1 *John* 2. 3. (misunderstood by them) *If we say we have no sin*, &c: Answer first, I say with *Augustine* upon the *Galatians*: *Aliud est non peccare, aliud non habere peccatum.* Secondly, The following words of the Apostle are, *If we confess our sins, He is Faithful and Just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness*; And he that is cleansed from sin, is the same that was before said to have sin;

Now it is said in the 7th. verse, *The Blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin*; Here cleanseth is in the present Tense: Now to be defiled with sin, and cleansed from all sin at the same time, seems a contradiction, and therefore must be admitted to be two several times; Let our Author solve this by a fair Commentary with the next.

To his Answer, *That it follows no more that the Apostle John was at that time defiled with sin, then that the Apostle James was a Curser, when he said of the tongue, herewith curse we men*; Our Author Replyes, There is no Parity; And why? Is it because they are both in the plural Number and present Time? No, But saith he, *James* speaketh of gross outbreakings, and *John* simply of the nature of sin.

Very good, I see our Author can distinguish betwixt *mortal* and *venial sins*; Of which, sure lying must be one (in his Judgement) or else he had been unsainted long since. But knowing this would not do, he tells us, the Apostle *John* even in his best Frame, had sinful actions, and citeth *Revel:* 19. 10, 11. and 22. 8, 9. The first place is, *That he falls down at his feet to worship him*. And the second is,

That

That he fell down to worſhip before the feet of the Angel. Which ſecond place cannot be underſtood of worſhipping the Angel, but of Worſhipping GOD before the feet of the Angel. But admit they both meant ſo, our Author muſt acknowledge this to have been one of his *venial ſins*, if a ſin at all; For it was but a miſtaking the Angel, who in Chapter 18. 1. Is ſaid to have great Power, and the Earth was enlightned with his Glory; I ſay it was but a taking this Angel to have been Chriſt: And therefore he may ſee the LORD did not permit the Apoſtle to commit the ſinful action upon that miſtake, but ſtopped him; And he reads not that *John* offered to worſhip the Angel after he knew him to be his fellow ſervant. And ſo theſe two Texts he boaſts of, can do hm no ſervice.

To the reſt in this Paragraph he giveth no Anſwer, but It's falſe; And again, we know, &c: without any Reaſon, but his imperious aſſertion, which deſerves to be neglected.

Next he indeavours to prove from *Eccleſiaſtes* 7. 20. *That Men ſin daily*, &c: Which place he little urgeth, only tells us, He hath conſidered the *Hebrew*, and

hath found it the *Indicative Mood*; So ſaith our Author, *Ergo, verum*; But he muſt excuſe me, to think *Jerom* and *Junius*, *Tremellius* as good *Linguiſts* as he, and yet have tranſlated it in the *Potential Mood, and may not ſin*.

His next is *Rom:* 7. 17. From which Texts he ſaith *J: B.* hath proved, That the Apoſtle was in a *Carnal State* in reſpect of ſinning at that time: But he hath not been ſo juſt as to tell us how he proved it, leaſt his Arguments ſhould have been found like theſe, he cites page 200. But I wonder how a Man of Senſe can aſſert it, if he but read the next Chapter throughout; The ſecond verſe whereof cleareth this matter, where the Apoſtle ſaith, *The Law of the Spirit of Life in Chriſt Jeſus, had made him free from the law of ſin and death*; And many times after witneſſeth a better Condition; As that he had *fought the good fight*, &c: *Nothing could ſeparate him from the Love of GOD*, &c: And *Phil:* 4. 13. *I can do all things through Chriſt that ſtrengtheneth me.* His Objection of the Apoſtle *John* is already anſwered. That of *Peter* proves no more then that a Man may ſin, which is not denyed. He comes at laſt to his great Argument.

If

If we find no Inſtances in Scripture of ſuch perſons as were ſo perfect, as that they did not ſin, then to imagine ſuch a Perfection is but a groundleſs fancie and dream: But the former is true. *Ergo*, &c.

For anſwer let the Reader obſerve, firſt that our Author finding his Brothers Argument fully refuted by R: B: hath not attempted the *Vindication* of it; But he ſaith, the Argument was proponed three different wayes, the firſt, of which he chooſeth to anſwer unto.

Anſwer, Either this Argument which he anſwereth unto, was to the purpoſe or not? If it was to the purpoſe it was right to anſwer it; Seeing our Author calls them not three arguments, but one proponed three different wayes, any of which his Adverſary might lawfully chooſe; If it was not to the purpoſe (as was the greateſt part of his book) then he might have ſpared it; But becauſe R: B: took not our Authors argument to task (which perhaps was not there) he ſaith, he muſt confeſs *he skipt over that which did cut this point of Quakeriſm in the Jugular Vein.*

This is a *Rhodomontado expreſſion*, more like *Don: Quixot* then a ſober man writ-

ing

ing about Religion, tho very ordinary with our Author; But let us see what cause there is for all this froath.

First then, I deny his *Minor*, for I can find him many recorded in Scripture, of whom there is no failing recorded; to wit, *Enoh*, *Melchizedeck*, *Elias*, *John* the *Baptist*, and many of the *Prophets*, and let him prove by Scripture that these men *did sin*; For *Athanasius* in his fourth Oration against the *Arrians*, saith, *That many were born holy, and free from all sin, and particularly Elias, and John Baptist.*

Secondly, I ask him whether the *sins of the Saints were recorded in Scripture for our imitation*, which he seems here to insinuate, for we say not that we ought *not to walk according to the Scripture*, But that *the sins of the Saints are recorded, that we may shun them, not that we should follow them*; neither is there want of *precep's* and *examples* in *abundance* for us without them.

But before I leave this matter I shall give one argument yet, *If there be any who need no Repentance*, then certainly there be some who do not break *GOD's Commands dayly* in *thought, word and deed*, but the first is true, *Ergo*, &c. The *Minor* is proved by *Luke* 15. 7.

Chapter

Chapter VII.

Of Waiting in silence; And of the Sacraments.

OUR Author Denominates his seventh Chapter of *silent Worship*, which is a word of his own Coyning, and none of ours, and then falls to a vindication of his brother *J: B*'s Calumnies; The first whereof is. *John Brown* asserts, that *R: B*: would have them understand, *that Christs Spiritual Resurrection was never till now.*

R: B: answereth, *I speak only with reference*

rence to the time since the Apostacie, and not to the primitive times before.

Our Author sayes, first, any may judge by his eleventh proposition, *&c.* Or by this Chapter annexed thereto.

I am truely willing that any be judge that is not byassed, as most part of the *Clergie are;* And therefore I intreat the Reader to see *R: B's Apologie*, page 247, where he will find this calumny more clearly obviated. His second answer is, he is unhappy in removing this calumny, for the *Apostacie* was working in the Apostles time. But he is more unhappy in overturning one of the two chief grounds of the *Protestant Religion* assigned to the *Jesuite* by *J: M:* To wit, the Fathers in the first three Centuries.

But shews ignorance here as well as malice, for if there was no true *Spiritual worshp* in the *Church* after the *Apostasie* began to work; Then according to our Author, *there was no Spiritual Worship in the Church till the Reformation*; The contrary of which *R: B:* asserteth; Yea even in the darkest times of *Popery* he citeth *Bernard*, *Bonaventur*, *Taulerus*, and *Thomas a Kempis*, and also commends the *first Reformers* for denying the *Popish abominable*

nable ſuperſtition and *Idolatrie* of the *Maſs*, the *Adoration of Saints* and *Angels*, *the Veneration of the Reliques*, the *Viſitation of Sepulchres*.

Yet nevertheleſs, Our Author in his third and fourth anſwer compares us to *Muncer*, *John* of *Lyden*, *Arrius*, *Pelagius*, and what not; And it's much he hath not called us *Papiſts* too: But let the Reader judge whether he hath mended *J: B*'s matter, and not rather added lie to lie, and calumny to calumny.

The ſecond Calumny he defends is, *That we acknowledge no motion, nor inward breathing of the Spirit, but what is extraordinary, and meerly Enthuſiaſtick*; As alſo, *That we abſtract from all means*. Which Calumny our Author ſaith, he hath above evinced to be a Truth, in his firſt and ſecond Chapters; How truely the Reader muſt Judge.

But he giveth us a ſecond Inſtance, *R: B:* denyeth that *Studied Sermons are means appointed of GOD*, (for what he adds are his own words, and not *R: B*'s) but behold the *Argument*; Studied Sermons are denyed, *Ergo*, all means are denyed; Be aſhamed.

His third is, *That the Quakers ſpiritual life*

life is nothing but Nature, Thus he ſaith, he proved, Chapter 2d. *That all their Grace and Light, is nothing but the ſmall remainders of the once bright ſhining Image of GOD in Man.* To which I alſo refer the Reader. And withall, I muſt deſire the Reader to take notice of our Authors little Tricks, in his Parallel betwixt us and the *Anabaptiſts*, he referrs to what follows of his Book; And in the end of his Book he referrs to what is paſt, thinking (it's like) his own implicite Hearers will take it on truſt; But I expect thou will trace him better, which if thou do, thou will ſoon find what he is for all his vaine boaſt.

The fourth Calumny he *denyeth*, and ſaith his Adverſary only *enquireth* it. If this be a ſufficient Anſwer, let him conſult his own Book, page 167. 168. and 169. Where he will needs have a *Query* to import a *full affirmation* of the thing queried, and ſo proves himſelf ſignally diſſingenious, and alſo leaves his brother in the myre.

The fifth Calumny, he ſaith, depends upon the Contraverſy about *Perfection*, and ſo ſhifts it.

The ſixth Calumny, he inſiſts on is, *That there*

there is no ſetting about Prayer, or other Duties, without a previous motion of the Spirit.

The Nicety is in the word *Previous*, and therefore I ſhall refer him to the fifth *Section* of *Quakeriſm confirmed*, where that matter is fully handled, and all his *Quibles* Anſwered; Which Book I perceive the Man hath read, and ſo might either been ſilent, or brought us ſome new thing, which he hath not yet done.

The ſeventh Calumny is, *That Goſpel Worſhip putteth away all external actions*; And upon this Calumny, his brother *I: B:* had charged a Contradiction upon *R: B:* Yet our Author beſtows no more anſwer upon both. But, He needeth not grudge at this, for their practiſe helpeth us to expone their Words; If this be fair dealing, let the Reader Judge.

He tells us next, *That J: B: compareth us to the Old Pithonicks*, And as if his brother had not been ſlanderous enough, he adds, I alwayes compared them in ſuch fitts to the *Cumæna Sybilli*, as ſhe is deſcrived by *Virgil 6. Ænead:* And *John Brown* (*paſſim*) That we are acted by **the Devil, poſſeſt by him at his pleaſure**. To all which I ſhall again with *R: B:* modeſtly reply, *That of all men the Presbyterians might hav-*

have forborn this, had they but remembred the Stuartown sickness.

But our Author giveth us a mighty difference thus, *These at Stuartown after those outlettings of the Spirit upon them, cleaved to the Scriptures as the only Rule, and were endeared to the Ministers of Jesus Christ, and his Word and Sacraments*; We mean, saith he, *Water-baptism* and the *Communion* of the *Lords Body* in *Bread* and *Wine*, &c: Which saye he, were commanded by Christ to be used until his *coming to Judgement*: Which are contemned and vilified by the *Quakers*. And for all this, we must trust our Authors word; But how comes it then that our present *Presbyterians*, who are found in all those things now have no such *Outlettings of the Spirit*? Yea, *why are they found the chief Opposers and blasphemers of such Outlettings of the Spirit*? If they were good then, I think they should be expected and waited for now? But this would savour of *Enthusiasm*, and therefore cannot be endured.

But I must tell our Author the true Reason, why these *Outlettings* of the *Spirit* ceased among them; *To wit*, Because they forsook that *Power* which reached them at first, and betook themselves to Men, who in stead of the *Gospel of peace*, preached

ed up Warrs, Seditions, Tumults, Strife, and Contention; And in ſtead of *Prayers, Tears*, preached up Swords and Spears, in ſtead of *Suffering*, fighting, and contending with the *Civil Magiſtrate*; Which was never the way of CHRIST nor Chriſtians. As for *Water-Baptiſm*, and *Bread*, and *Wine*, it is no good Argument that they cleaved to them, which are called *Meats* and *Drinks*, and *Divers Baptiſms*, and *Carnal Ordinances*, while they wanted that *Righteouſneſs*, *Peace*, and *Joy* in the *Holy Ghoſt*, wherein the Kingdom of GOD ſtandeth.

But our Author returns to his old trade of citations, and gives us an *Engliſh Miniſter* and *Paget* for his Authors, which books I never ſaw, and may be as great liars as himſelf. Who may the next time be cited as a famous Author, but admitt all theſe were truths (as they are not) What then? If our Author will but invite me with the next I will give him undenyable Inſtances of *Presbyterian Prieſts* that have farr out done all theſe Inſtances of his, in abominable wickedneſs, not mentioned in the *Presbyterian Eloquence*, but this is a pitiful way of Reaſoning.

He cannot omit *Virgil* and *Latinus*, to ſhew us that he reads the *Heathen Poets*, it

ſeems

seems, as carefully as the *Bible*; Otherwise he had never inserted such a foolish tale, as the *Heathen* Lying upon Sheeps Skins; And maliciously adds, which if the *Quakers* do, or not, I am uncertain. This one Sentence in the end renders all the rest uncertain and rediculous: But it is observable in our Adversaries, that when a *Scottish Priest* hath a lie to vent he goeth to *England* for it, and in *England* they fetch it from *Scotland*, *Holland*, or some forraign place at a distance, to cover deceit and malice.

And now at last, we are come to *silent waiting upon the LORD*, or turning *inward* our *minds* to hear what the *LORD will speak in us*; As *David* saith, *I will hear what the LORD will speak in me*, &c.

This our Author saith, is impossible to a man, except he be sleeping or in an extacie; But giveth no proof, but *ipse dixit*; As for *Extasies* I know them not, but sleeping men have their minds sometimes very busie, and even our Author himself, I doubt, is not quite free from dreams.

And because he cites *Virgil* here, I think *he who so much delights in Heathen Poets might have been at the pains to read some Christian Poets* As *Boetus de Consol: Phil: 3: lib: metrum:* 11: where he will find this matter clearly held forth

forth; And even Beza commendeth *silence*, tho not that *turning* in of the *mind*, which that other speaks of. But whereas he sayes, *the Soul must act upon some object*; He sheweth how ignorant he is of true *self-denyal*, as one of his *Transmarine Divines*, *saith*, *pure negationes sui*, &c. These pure acts of *self-denyal* are, that a man ceale from his own works, his own willing and running, and from his *thoughts* and *imaginations*, which are only evil continually, and are as clouds and obstacles, which hinder of that Divine *inward peace-giving light in the bottom of the Soul*; These Clouds therefore being removed, the *light* immediatly shineth upon the *denyal of self*, neither (saith he) can there be a *vacuum here*, but these are *Heresies* as well as *Mysteries* to our *Presbyterian Clergie*, who Preach, Pray, and Praise in their own willings, and by their own strength, without waiting for *Divine assistance*, or the influence of the *Spirit of Christ*, without which they affirm a man may be a sufficient *Minister*.

But saith he, *R.B.* saith, *the Old Man*, *the Man of sin that is corrupted*, *must dye*, *and be crucified*; And again, saith he, *albeit in one sense they are said to die*: *Yet they more truely live*, Gal: 2. 20.

Upon this our Author quibles, saying, *that*

that in ſtead of *relinquiſhing all thoughts, he now only defendeth the living of Carnal thoughts*, but this he calls a cheat: For ſaith he, *there is a time to be preſuppoſed in which the Spirit is not moving*, &c. And what then? Muſt *Patroclus* Preach? Yea, altho Chriſt hath ſaid, *Without me ye can do nothing*; Yea, *Calvine* ſaith on the Fourth Commandmant, *The Sabbath is a reſting from our own works, that GOD may Work in us.* As for a time betwixt, which ſeems to be the only thing he quibles upon, I have told before, and now again, that how ſoon the Clouds are diſſipat by a true ſelf-denyal; The *Sun of Righteouſneſs* immediatly appeareth, and there is no *vacuum*. As to what he talketh of the Apoſtle, I hope when *he was dead*, and *Chriſt lived in him*, our Author will not be ſo groſs as to ſay, that he acted without Chriſt as to Spiritual things, tho the faculties of his Soul were as *vived* and *active* as our Authors now are.

What he ſaith in page 214 on this ſubject, only ſheweth his ignorance in theſe things, or want of experience, or that he thinks GOD to be at a diſtance, and to require a time to come to man to work upon him after he hath denyed ſelf.

His

His next Quible is concerning appointed *times*, for *meeting together to wait upon the LORD*. Alledging that we should have a *previous motion* to every Meeting, otherwise (saith he) *They limit the Spirit*. But might *not* our Author have allowed us the use of this Interpreter of Scripture in such Externall cases as appointing Meetings, to wit, His Christian Prudence and Wisdom; For I hope our Author will not say, that Meeting together is an Act of Worship, and therefore I refer him to *Quakerism confirmed*, for a full Answer to his Quibles, which if he had been just, he had taken notice of here.

In his *Vindication* of *Calvine* about Sabbath Day, he doth him very little kindness, telling the World he contradicteth himself twenty seven years after he had wrote his Institutions: I wish he had done so with his doctrine of *Reprobation* also. But we have many famous *Protestants* for us in that matter, as well as *Calvine*, As Dr. *Barnes*, *William Tindal*, and almost all Christians.

He chargeth *R. B.* with a contradiction for saying, That *Peter* and *Paul had a Natural Man*, in which the *devil might work*, and a *Spiritual Man which might resist*.

This he ſaith contradicts his doctrine of Perfection, or at leſt his Expoſition of *Rom:* 7.

For the firſt, R. B. alwayes aſſerted a Natural and Spiritual Man, as may be ſeen in all his Writtings.

And for the Second, It is one thing to ſay, *the Devil may work, and the Spirit reſiſt*, and another to ſay, *the Devil doth work and overcome*; The firſt may be ſaid of *Paul* in his beſt ſtate; The ſecond is our Adverſarys doctrine which we deny: And thus his alledged Contradiction is a meer falſe Inſinuation.

In the next place, he accuſeth R. B. of Railing, He ſhould have ſaid *R. Macquair*, and uſed his own phraſe. *Quis tulerit Gracchos*, &c. But he calls them Prieſts, (ſaith he underſtand of *Baal*) Thus he hath helped R. B. For *conſcius ipſe ſibi de ſe putat omnia dici.*

To defend his Brother, ſaying, *That Watching is not a turning inward, but a looking outward.* To which R. B. replyeth: Then a man ſhut up in a dungeon could not watch ſpiritually: He anſwers, That by looking outwardly, they underſtand minding GOD, and our diſtance from him, and the like: This is Nonſenſe, as

if

it by looking outward a man could see GOD.

His bauble about *Thaulerus* is nothing but a malicious Insinuation of our being *Papists*, which none that knoweth us will believe: *Thomas a Kempis* was a *Papist*, yet his Book of the *Imitation of Christ* is more spiritual, than any *Presbyterian* Book I ever yet saw, And if he will call me a *Papist* for saying so, I cannot help it, but I am sure it is false; And if *Popery* should prevail in the Nation (which GOD forbid) it would soon appear whether they or we were the truest *Protestants*.

To conclude this matter, It is evident, That our Author is against all Spirituall Worship, Mental prayer, Quietness of mind, &c. As opposite to that sordid Trade of Preaching for hire, and divining for money: And if *Michael Molmos* (of whom all *Protestants*, that I have seen mention him, writ favourably) had appeared at *Glasgow* in *Scotland*, when he appeared at *Rome*, and *Naples* in *Italy*, It is manifest our *Presbyterian* Clergie would have accused him as fiercely here, as the *Jesuites* did there, Which among other things may shew that they are not mistaken who call them Cousin-Germans.

Section Second,
Of BAPTISM.

HERE our Author very wiſely paſſeth by a great part of the Contraverſie; To wit, *whether Sprinkling of Infants*, (the only Baptiſm now in being in the *Presbyterian Church*) be either the Baptiſm of *John* or of *CHRIST*? Both which we deny; And this our Author ſhould firſt have proved before he had accuſed: For admit another man be wrong in his Religion, he can never be oblieged to change untill his Adverſary prove his to be right. Neither is it juſt to deſire him to come from his own, (tho wrong) to yours, except you can prove yours to be right: But for this he muſt conſult his good Friend *Hicks* the *Anabaptiſt*, whoſe weapons he hath often borrowed in this conflict.

Secondly, The *Weſtminſter Confeſſion*, chap. 27. num. 4. ſaith, *Neither of the Sacraments may be diſpenſed by any, but*

but by a Miniſter of the Word lawfully ordained.

Now we deny that any of the *Preſbyterian Prieſt-hood* are ſuch, and therefore (tho theſe ſigns were to continue) they may not diſpenſe them. Theſe our Authour knew well enough, but skips over them.

But it is obſervable, That the Scriptures cited in the Confeſſion to prove this Article, do all of them point to an *inward Call*, one is *Hebrews* 5. 4, *and no man taketh this honour to himſelf, but he that is called of GOD as was Aaron*: I hope this was not to derive his Call from an Apoſtate Idolatrous Church, as that of *Rome*, from which our *Presbyterian Prieſts* are not aſhamed to derive theirs.

Thirdly, The *Presbyterians* acknowledge that theſe ſigns are not abſolutely neceſſary to Salvation, and in the time of their laſt Reign, limited Baptiſm to Preaching dayes, and refuſed to the Children of Ignorant or Scan-

Scandalous Parents, by which means many Infants dyed without it, Tho they ſay that the *contempt* of *it is damnable*: And ſince the late Revolution, I read of one of them who ſaid, *It was but the Relicts of Popiſh Superſtition to be curious for Baptiſing of Children*; And *that he knew a good and godly Miniſter who lived to a great Age, and was never Baptized.* What then needs all this clamour againſt us.

The firſt thing he takes notice of, is, *the many diviſions and diſputes among Chriſtians about theſe Signs*, which he faſly calls one of R. Bs. Apologetical Arguments, whereas it is nothing but a part of his Introduction, as any that reads his *Apology* may ſee: And in his *Vindication*, he tells his Adverſary *page* 162. he hath not uſed it as an Argument at all; And in his *Apologie* tells them, how much it would contribute to Peace, that they would lay aſide ſuch Heathniſh and Barbarous words as theſe: Nevertheleſs our Authour will have him a

Heathen for this advice to procure unity; but it is too manifeſt that the *Salamanders* we have to do with are *Peace-haters.*

Next, he falls upon the word *Sacrament*, which he muſt confeſs is not a Scripture expreſſion, and from this draweth a fooliſh conſequence, to wit, *Ergo, the thing is not in them*; he ſhould have ſaid, *Ergo, its a Humane invention*, introduced by the Apoſtacy, and therefore to be laid aſide by the Reformation, but he is not ſo ingenuous, but he ſaith, the word *Trinity* is not to be found in *Scripture*; but the thing imported by the word is, Why may not then the Scripture words be uſed, and both theſe words laid aſide? Except our Clergie think they can word better than the *Spirit of GOD.* But our Authour who is ſo well acquaint with the Latine Poets, cannot be ſo ignorant of their Hiſtorians as not to know the true and moſt common ſignification of *Sacrament* to be a

Mi-

Military Oath; And therefore I think there is no *presbyterian* ceremony that I know which ſo well deſerves the name of a Sacrament as the *Solemn League* and *Covenant*.

His next buſineſs is to deal with *Epheſ.* 4. 5. from Which R. B. proves there is but one Baptiſm, to which *J. Brown* anſwereth, *the Scripture no where ſaith, that there is but one only Baptiſm.* To which R. B. replyeth, it will as well prove that there is one onely Baptiſm, as that there is One only GOD: But our Author very candidly quites the matter, and betakes himſelf to Faith; And becauſe *there are* (ſaith he) *more kinds of Faiths than one, the Text muſt be ſo expounded concerning Baptiſm*: But let me have the one Faith and the one Baptiſm mentioned here, and our Author may take all the reſt to himſelf, for there is a falſe Faith which I covet not.

But in page 219: he aſſerteth, *That the Baptiſm of the Holy Ghoſt is ceaſed*;

And

And in page 224: he boldly aſſerts, *That Johns Baptiſm is Chriſts whole true Baptiſm*, but ſayes nothing to prove it.

From which Doctrine it followeth, That whoſoever is Baptized with water is Baptized with the Holy Ghoſt. *Secondly*, That as many as are baptized with water have put on CHRIST. And *Thirdly*, That the Apoſtle *Paul* erred grievouſly in *Acts* 19: when he ſaid, *unto what then were ye baptized, ſeeing they had received Johns Baptiſm before*: But the man is ſo confuſed all through this Section, that he knows not what he aſſerts, for in the ſame page 219: he again aſſerts, *That Johns Baptiſm was no Figure of the New Teſtament Baptiſm*; this he aſſerts without any proof, yet fearing it may not paſs, he adds, *Otherwiſe if the Sign be oppoſed to the thing ſignified, we may underſtand the Baptiſm of the Holy Ghoſt, and Fire, ſpoken of Matth: 3: of Sanctification and Mortification.*

What a hodg-podg is this! *Schitian* like

like to fight and flee, or to change ſhapes like a *Proteus*; And firſt tells us Dogmatically, *it is no Figure*; And then, *if it be as a ſign oppoſed to thing ſignified, &c.* That *Sanctification* as well *Mortification is a part of the one Baptiſm*, is not denyed.

To R: Bs. ſaying, it is a lye, That he would have none to be Baptized in the Spirit, but ſuch as are endued with theſe Extraordinary Gifts: To this I ſay, he anſwers; *But do they not ſtill boaſt of their Revelations, and Inſpirations, comparing themſelves to the Apoſtles, calling themſelves perfect, &c.* A heap of groſs untruths; And yet this is the beſt return we meet with, to mend one lie by making two or three more.

In page 220: contrary to that of *Epheſ:* 4: 5: from which R: B: infers, if Water Baptiſm be to continue, there ſhould be two Baptiſms. J: B: anſwers, *it might be as well ſaid, that there were two Circumciſions under the Old Teſtament, &c.* Upon which our Au-

Authour ſaith, *he grants his conſequence*, and challengeth his Adverſary *of Levity* for ſuch an Argument : Here he begins with a lie, for R: B: ſaith, if he can anſwer no better then by ſmyling at it, we muſt pity the Levity of his Spirit. Now let the Reader judge, if the Argument was the ground of the challenge ; or his laughing at that which he could not anſwer. But R: B: anſwereth, What then ? As long as the outward continued there were two; to wit, the *outward* and the *inward*, that of the Fleſh and that of the heart ; and let him ſtretch the ſimile as far as he can, it will help him nothing, for the Apoſtle ſaith, *Rom.* 2. 28. *That it is not Circumciſion which is outward in the fleſh*, becauſe it was a Figure, and all Figures were to ceaſe, even ſo of the other : That is not CHRISTS Baptiſm which is outward, to the putting away the filth of the fleſh, but the anſwer of a good Conſcience, 1 *Pet.* 3. 21.

But

But he comes again to Faith, ſaying, *he may as well conclude from this place, that there is but one Faith, as that there is but one Baptiſm.* And yet ſaith our Author, there are diverſe kinds of Faith mentioned in the Scripture, as the *Doctrine of Faith*, *Galat.* 1. 23. The *profeſſion of Faith*, 1 *Tim.* 1. 19. The *Faith of Miracles*, or the like; This is (if learned at all) ſo learned, that I freely acknowledge I cannot underſtand it, to wit, that the profeſſion of Faith is one Faith, the Doctrine of Faith another, The Faith of Miracles a third Faith, And the One Faith a fourth Faith, in which none of the other Three are concerned: This will require four ſeveral and different definitions, which when our Author giveth us, we may judge of the truth of his aſſertion, till then he muſt excuſe me to think he deſerves a ſmyle, no leſs then R. B. did from his Brother J. B. and will find he hath begged the Queſtion as well as his Brother did:

For

For I perceive he builds upon his own miſtake, That no man who hath this one Faith can miſcarry. But I tell him, ſome have made ſhipwrack of Faith, and of a good Conſcience. And this is the Scripture teſtimony: So albeit ſome might work Miracles, and thereafter become wicked; yet this ſaith nothing againſt their having true Faith at that time: And if, he ſaith, *every one who hath true Faith, doth not work miracles*; The anſwer is eaſie, ſuch a great meaſure of Faith is not required for Salvation, yet difference in the meaſure makes no difference in the kind. Neither doth it follow, that Baptiſm with Water is included in this one Baptiſm; For the Apoſtle *Peter* plainly contra-diſtinguiſheth them, 1 *Pet.* 3. 21.

So *Robert Barclays* Argument (which *Patroclus* (minding his old Friend *Achilles*) mocks at, ſtands in full force; Which becauſe he hath ſo minchingly ſet down, I will ſet down at large,

and

and expect a more ſolid anſwer next, the Argument is this, *ſeing ſuch as were baptized with water, were not therefore baptized with the Baptiſm of CHRIST, therefore water Baptiſm cannot be the Baptiſm of CHRIST.*

But he comes to his old trade again, accuſing R. B. of *Socinianiſm*, and a little after muſt be at Circumciſion again, alleadging that what ever can be ſaid againſt Water Baptiſm from 1 *Pet.* 3. 21. will militate as much againſt Circumciſion under the Law.

But it is manifeſt, that the Law was a Figurative, Typical and Shadowy-Diſpenſation, which ſtood in meats and drinks, and diverſe Baptiſms and Carnal Ordinances impoſed on them untill the time of Reformation: But that the Goſpel was ſuch a diſpenſation, I think our Author will not dare aſſert; And therefore the difference is very evident, that altho Circumciſion was to continue among the reſt of the Carnal Ordinances until the

time

time of Reformation; Yet the Goſpel being a *ſpiritual diſpenſation*, in which Carnal Ordinances, Types & Shadows were to ceaſe after the *Subſtance* was come, ſee *Col.* 2. from 16. to the end; ſo *Johns* Baptiſm was to ceaſe among the reſt of the ſhadows, ſeeing *John* was ſent only to the *Jews* to prepare the way of the LORD.

His next aſſault is nothing but wind and froth, wherein he challengeth R. B. for denying *John Browns* Expoſitions of *Gal.* 3. 27. and *Col.* 2. 12. *Which J. B.* ſaith, *may be underſtood of putting on CHRIST by profeſſion, tho not in Truth and Reality*; For which Epoſition ſaith R. B. I ſhall expect his proof next time, if he hath any. And now let the Reader judge, if our Author have any ground for his boaſting: And whether he who hath undertaken the defence of *John Brown* was concerned to have proven this ſpurious interpretation of his Brother to be the meaning of the Apoſtle: For *Robert Barkclay*

Barkclay was no further concerned then to deny it, as I think any ſincere Chriſtian will do: And therefore it is manifeſt, that the ſeared Conſciences are his own & his Brothers; who dare adventure to cheat the World, by putting a ſenſe upon the Apoſtles words, which was never intended by him.

In the next place he referrs us to *J. Brown*, which is a fair *Go-by*, but ſubjoyns (more like a Pope than a Preſbyter, if they be diſtinguiſhable) very imperiouſly. Next, *I ſay* (ſaith he) *that Johns Baptiſm, as being inſtituted by CHRIST, and comprehending the thing ſignified, is not only Baptiſm with Water, but CHRISTS whole true Baptiſm, and ſo this quibling is groundleſs.* And why? Becauſe our Authour ſayeth ſo. But leſt he ſhould quarrel, let us conſider what he hath ſaid, Firſt, *then*, ſaith he, *Johns Baptiſm, as being inſtituted by CHRIST, &c.* *Anſwer*, That all the Baptiſms, and Carnal Ordinances of the Law were inſtituted by

by CHRIST is not denyed; But that *Johns Baptiſm* was inſtituted by *Chriſt* after he took *Fleſh* of the *Virgin Mary*, is denyed, and the Scriptures proves the contrary, *Acts* 19. 4. Next, he ſaith, *and comprehending the thing ſignified*: Very well, I hope our Author will no more quarrel with the Papiſts about *opus operatum*: For if Water Baptiſm (*Johns baptiſm*) comprehend the thing ſignified, then it is the Laver of Regeneration, confers Grace, and is abſolutely neceſſary to Salvation: But the Papiſts will hardly accept of him, for, *conveniet nulli qui ſecum diſſidet ipſi*. He hath ſaid in page 219. *that John could only adminiſter the ſign.* And in his other page, he aſſerts, *That Johns Baptiſm comprehends the thing ſignified*, this language will need a gloſs.

He comes now to the words of *John*, *He muſt encreaſe, but I muſt decreaſe*; This our Authour and his Brother will have to be underſtood of their per-

ſons: And after ſome of his ordinary vanity, tells his meaning thus, I anſwer therefore, that the meaning of the place is, "That the Perſon of *Chriſt* "was to grow more and more in ho-"nour and glory, ſo that within a lit-"tle the Fame and Repute of *John* "was to be Eclipſed through the "Brightneſs and Splendor of *Chriſt*. To this (I think) his own phraſe may be added, *ſpectatum admiſſi riſum teneatis, &c.* For where did the *Jews* call *John* a Devil? Did not they receive *him ak a Prophet? Or did they call him a Glutton, and a Drunkard? Or did they crucifie him, or ſeek his life*; If *Herod* had let him alone? All which ſhew that they honoured the perſon of *John* more than the Perſon of CHRIST: But it is evident that *Johns* Miniſtration was to decreaſe, as being only to prepare the way to CHRISTS Miniſtration, whoſe Miniſtry then eclipſed the Miniſtry of *John*, as it hath done ever ſince: And therefore if he be not

yet

yet pleaſed, he muſt give us a more ſound expoſition next.

In the end of page 224. he undertakes to prove, that the Baptiſm of *John* was no Legal Rite; His firſt Argument is, "All the Legal Rites, ſuch "as held forth CHRIST and his Benefites by way of Type to the "whole Church, which each Member was to practiſe, were either inſtitut by *Moſes*, or before him, therefore this could not be a Legal Rite, "which was commanded directly at "the coming of the *Meſſiah*, and at "his very appearance, preaching to "the World, when there could be no "uſe of Legal Rites, but ſuch, which "were withing a little to be aboliſhed.

Anſwer, *Firſt*, I deny that any Rite was inſtitute by *Moſes*, but as a Servant he publiſhed the Inſtitution of theſe Rites to the People, and Recorded them, and theſe before him in his Writings; ſo that if GOD had ſeen it meet He could have added new Rites

by any other of His ſervants, as He did this of Baptiſm by *John*, who was as great as *Moſes*.

And *ſecondly*, This Rite which was commanded directly at the comming CHRIST, when there could be no uſe of Legal Rites, but theſe which were within a little time to be aboliſhed, ought now (as it is long ſince) to be aboliſhed. Theſe are his own words.

His ſecond Argument is, *All the Legall Rites are abrogate in the New Teſtament, but no where is Baptiſm abrogate, &c.* Otherwiſe, ſaith he, *ſhew me the place of Scripture; but note* 1 *Pet.* 3. 21. Is not this a fair Adverſary? If *Hector* had been adviſed by *Patroclus* what Arms to uſe, he might readily have eſcaped his hand. But *Patroclus* muſt take this Scripture in the firſt place, for the Repeal or Abrogation of *Johns* Baptiſm; And leſt he ſhould grumble, I ſhall add *Acts* 19. 2, 3, 4. and *Heb.* 9. 10. with *John* 3. 30.

His third Argument is *Matth.* 11. 12. *All the Prophets, and the Law propheſied untill John*: And what then? Was not *John* one of the Prophets? Yes, and that a great One, *yet the leaſt in the kingdom of Heaven is greater than he*; Which evidently proves he was no Goſpel Prophet: As for his certainty of taking the *particle Untill*, excluſively by the collation of places, I tell him, I have found him trip ſo often, I ſhall not take his word.

His fourth Argument is to prove *John was no Legal Miniſter, becauſe propheſied of before he came, which no Legal Thing, Perſon, or Rite was.* But here he runs too faſt, the Kings of *Iſrael* were propheſied of by *Balaam*; And *Judah's* Soveraignity was propheſied of by *Jacob*, and 1 *Sam.* 15. 28. But if *Iohn* was a Goſpel Miniſter, how then was the leaſt in the Kingdom of Heaven greater than he?

In page 126. he comes to 1 *Cor.* 1. 17. Where *Paul* ſayes, *CHRIST ſent*

me

me not to Baptize, to this *John Brown* answereth, *If Paul had not been put to Baptize, why would he have done it?* R. B. Answereth, "I think it needless "for me to answer the absurdity he "would here fix upon the Apostle; it "sufficeth me, and I hope will other "good Christians, that the Apostle "saith positively, *he was not sent to* "*Baptize*; This our Author quarrels "at, and in the end saith, *he knoweth* "*that we expone Pauls words,* [*That he* "*was not sent to Baptize*] *for the less* "*principal part of his Errand*, and citeth "*Hos.* 6. 6. *Matth.* 9. *Ierem.* 2. 23.

The first two are the same, to wit, *I desired Mercy and not Sacrifice*, and are explained by the context, and the knowledge of GOD more then *Burnt-Offerings*; And that of *Ierem.* 2. 23. *I am not polluted, I have not gone after Baalim*, is not at all to the purpose; Except he will say, that the *Jews* were unjustly accused, which I think he will be afraid to assert. That all the

Co-

Corinthians were Baptized with Water, he doth not prove; And it was known to be deferred by many of the Primitive Christians untill their old Age: And altho *Paul* reproved the tenacious sticking to *Jewish* Rites, yet some of them were continued even to *Tertullians* time.

Secondly, He saith, *That Paul doth not say, that his Fellow Apostles were not sent to Baptize, but himself alone*; But saith he not, *That he was not inferiour to any of them, but that he had laboured more, &c.*

Thirdly, That still he did administrat this Sacrament to the Gentiles, upon their embracing Christianity, which (saith he) *Mr.* Brown *hath shewed.*

Our Authour might have borrowed this from J. B. and given us a hint of it; For where J. B. hath any thing of worth (in his esteem) we are sure to get it, and very little else. To take *Not*, for the *not principal part*, would make wild work. R. B. hath shewen by

by 1 *Cor.* 2. 5. which our Authour is it at leasure to concern with, and therefore his reasonless Reasons are rejected.

In page 227. he comes to *Matth.* 28. 19. Where he saith, *R. B.* Denyeth *that while CHRIST was with the Apostles they baptized with CHRISTS Warrand.* And sayes, *he will wait his Adversaries proof of it.* To this our Authour, he hath done it already from *John* 3. 26. and 4. 3. *of which places the Quaker durst not take notice.*

That this is false, is evident, because *R. B.* rejects it as a sufficient proof; and the second citation (which should have been *John* 4. 2.) sheweth that the report brought to *John* in the former citation was a mistake, and therefore the first citation is to no purpose: The second is, *Tho JESUS himself baptized not, but his Disciples*; Doth this say any thing more for their having a Warrand to Baptize, then to fulfill all the *Levital Law*, which was not yet

abro-

abrogate, nor *nailed to His Croſs*? Did not He command ſome that were healled to go to the Prieſts, and offer according to the law of *Moſes*? But alſo *Iohns* Baptiſm was not then ceaſed; *Iohn* was alive, and ſome who had been *Iohns* Diſciples were become *CHRISTS* Diſciples, and ſo were continuing to Baptiſe; And we muſt expect an account of the warrand he pleads for from CHRIST, as a Goſpel Ordinance.

But R. B. ſaith, " What if it were " all granted? Did not the Apoſtles " prepare and eat the Paſſover with " CHRISTS Warrand and Authority, " is it therefore to continue?

He anſwers, *There is no parity*; firſt, *Becauſe the eating of the Paſſover was not impoſed upon the Gentiles, as acceſſory conſequent of their imbracing Chriſtianity*; Which he ſaith, Baptiſm was. This he had no leaſure to prove, becauſe he could not: For I hope he will confeſs that *Conſtantine the Great* had im-

imbraced Christianity, when he sat as a Member of the Council of *Nice*; and yet was not baptized for diverse years after: Neither can he be ignorant of many Gentiles who were not Baptized for many years after their imbracing the Christian Faith, and that even after Superstition began to creep in.

Secondly, He saith, *The Passover was an old Legal custom, whereas Baptism was in its very use.* Well then according to our Authour it was the nearer its fall, who tells us in page 225. *There could be no use of Legal rites then, but such as were within a little to be abolished.*

Page 228. he cites R. B. *saying*, "That "tho it be joined with Discipline, as "Circumcision was with it among "the Jews; it will no more follow, "that Baptism is to be continued "then Circumcision. He answereth, that the Baptism spoken of, to wit; *Matth.* 28. 19. is to continue he thinks,

Robert

Robert Barkclay will not deny: But the Queſtion is whither this be water-Baptiſm, to prove the continuance whereof he brings this Scripture, which ſeeing it is not to be *continued*, cannot be here *intended*.

Next, where they object the conſtant practice of the Apoſtles: This R. B. ſaith, 'The practice and teſtimony 'of the Apoſtle *Paul* declares to be 'falſe; this ſaith he, we have proved 'above to be falſe; but the Reader 'muſt be judge, to whom I leave it.

Next, he proves, *that abſtinance from blood and things ſtrangled were abrogate by* 1 *Cor*: 10. Where I will be oblidged to him to ſhow me one word of either the two. Next he gives us two whole Epiſtles, *Galat*: and *Timothy*, without citing either Chapter or Verſe, becauſe he could not: But that theſe two continued in the Church even in *Tertullians* time; I have told him above: So that his

Ab-

Abrogation hath not been intelligible to the Primitive Christians.

His second Argument is but a Repetition of what he hath said before, *That Baptism was alwayes upon condition of their embracing CHRIST*, which is false as I have shewed before. He saith, There is another ground given for *Water Baptism*, then Condiscention to the *Jews*; But he should have told by whom; For except himself, I yet know no other.

Thirdly, He saith, *Either the Apostles unrepealed Practice was not sufficient to walk by, or else this was abrogate afterwards*; But saith he, *The last is false, and the first is absurd.*

Answer, The first I have already shown from Scripture, and the last is no absurdity; Except it be so to the *Presbyterian Priests*, who pretend to be the Apostles Successours, and yet are not found in their unrepealled Practises, *Viz: To heal the Sick, to teach all Nations, and to Preach the Gospel*

ſpel freely; Which laſt, our Adverſaries are ſo farr from doing, that ſome of them have not been aſhamed to Print and publiſh to the World, *Nos non gratis accepimus, ergo neque gratis dare tenemur.*

Next he promiſeth us two Scriptures for one, where the Word *Baptiſm* is taken for Baptiſm with the *Holy Ghoſt*. We ſhall expect his Catalogue with the next; And yet he may give us ten for Circumciſion in the Fleſh, for one of Circumciſion in the Heart; Tho the firſt be abrogate and the latter continueth.

Page 230. He gives us an Argument thus, *To baptiſe with the Spirit is not in all the Scripture applyed to Men; Therefore it is not ſafe without very ſolide Reaſons to expone it ſo here.* This I confeſs, is modeſt, and therefore I ſhall modeſtly anſwer him, I never look'd upon Men as more then Inſtruments, neither in this nor in Teaching under the New Covenant: Chriſt

is

is the principal Teacher as well as the principal Baptiſer of His People, without whom they can do nothing. And therefore, I juſtly reject all ſuch Miniſters as profeſs that they can teach or baptiſe without the Immediate Aſſiſtance of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt.

His next is an Old Quible renewed thus, *All that they underſtand by this Spiritual Baptiſm, is ſufficiently expreſſed in the Context.* This hath been often propoſed and as often denyed, and the contrary proved; And therefore deſerves no anſwer upon his bare Aſſertion: See *Truths Defence*, page 129. where this is fully diſcuſſed: For the greateſt part of his work hath been to bring up old Stuff in a new Dreſs, knowing it will paſs with ſuch as have pinned their Faith on the Sleeves of ſuch Teachers, eſpecially having ſecured them in his Epiſtle to the Reader, with a *Touch not, Taſte not, Handle not (leſt ye be informed and find out the cheat.*

His

His next Paragraph being againſt the *Socinians*, I am not concerned with it.

His laſt hath nothing to the purpoſe, but one Perverſion; Where he R: B: inſinuateth, *That Peter commanded expreſly the Gentiles to be Circumciſed, which* (ſaith he) *he buildeth upon Galat*: 2. 12. Now *R: Barkclay* ſaith only, he conſtrained the *Gentiles*, And citeth verſe 14. Where it is ſaid, *Why compelleſt thou the Gentiles*, &c. After this Perverſion, he concludes with a Lie, where I leave him, and proceed. Adding only this one Argument.

That Rite or Ceremony which was inſtitute in the time of the Law, and alſo practiſed; That is before our LORD JESUS CHRIST began to preach the Goſpel; Muſt needs be a Legal Rite; But Baptiſm with Water, or *Johns* Baptiſm was ſuch; *Ergo*, It was a Legal Rite.

Sec-

Section Third,

Of the SUPPER, &c.

HE begins with a Lie, great Saying, *We deny the LORDS Supper*: Whereas we affirm, *That except a Man eat his Flesh and drink his Blood, he hath no Life in him.*

After he hath past by a whole page of R. B's. *Vindication*, He comes at last to J. B's. *Preaching to the Devil*, and denyes it to be his, but only an Inference from our Doctrine; But the Truth is, That upon R. B's. saying, *The Gospel is to be preached to every Creature under Heaven*, which is Scripture Language, I say, If upon this Text, *John Brown* make a preaching to the Devil, who is to blame? Whence it is a apparent, that his Simile about Murther, is Nonesense.

Next he comes to the *Priest* near *Lawder*, who *prayed to the devil*; This

This R. B. doth not aſſert for a truth, but only tells he heard it, and ſo is no Calumniator. But if I ſhould ſay, I have heard and read many as groſs things of ſome of you, I ſhould neither Lie nor Calumniat: See the *Presbyterian Eloquence.*

In the next Paragraph he hath nothing, but accuſeth R. B. for neglecting the Reaſon his Adverſary gave for his denyal, and then exclaims. But why ſhould I take notice, *&c:* Now ſhould not our Author rather have enforced this Reaſon? If it had been worth his while he had not skipt over it. But when he perceives it will not do, it is enough for him to ſay, *John Brown hath done wonders, why ſhould I take notice,* &c.

Next he comes to *Matth:* 14. 19. Which R: B: ſayes (according to our Author) will as much prove a Sacrament, as the places of the Goſpel, and the Epiſtle to the *Corinthians* ordinarly brought can do it.

Here Reader thou haſt another inſtance of his deceit, for clearing whereof I ſhall ſet down R. Bs. words, he asketh, *What ſignifieth CHRISTS bleſſing of the Bread, breaking, giving it to his Diſciples, deſiring them to eat? Anſwer,* Chriſt bleſſed the Bread, break it, and gave it to his Diſciples to eat, and they to others, where themſelves confeſs no ſuch Sacrament or Myſtery, as they would have here is reduceable, ſee *Matt.* 14. 19. *Mark* 6. 41. Now let the Reader judge of this mans ingenuity.

But, ſayes he, *R. B. never inferred any thing of this kind from ſimple bleſſing, but from other things conſidered with bleſſing; ſuch as this is my Body, this is my Blood; And the unrepealled command and Inſtitution,* 1 *Cor.* 11. and the like.

What Foppery is this? Doth he think to inferr the real Preſence from theſe words, *this is my Body?* Or will his meer aſſertion ſatisfie, that 1 *Cor.* 11. was

was a command for continuance of of that Sign? For to call it the inſtitution is noneſenſe, being inſtitute before *Paul* was a Chriſtian: but to uſe his own words, he hath done as well as he can, and is to be excuſed, if he would but ceaſe to boaſt.

That which followes is no better, where he citeth *R.B.* ſaying, he ſaith indeed, that the inſtitution of the Sacrament, 1 *Cor.* 11. was a permiſſion, *&c.*

When will this man learn to deal honeſtly? upon R. B's. ſaying, That 1 *Cor:* 11. *Will not prove the neceſſity of its being now performed*, J: B: ſayes, *That then it was an act of will worſhip and ſuperſtition.* R: B: Anſwereth, "What is done by permiſſion for a "time, is not Will Worſhip and Su-"perſtition, *&c:* Now it concerned our Author to prove that there was no Inſtitution of this Rite before this Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*; And in that caſe he had delivered his Brother, and made it an act of Will-Worſhip.

For his saying, *That* R: B: *granteth there was a Command for this Practise, is nothing to his purpose, for he did not say, this was it, but another before it.* And so this was no *Will-Worship* to the *Corinthians*, nor any proof for its continuance.

The next is about *washing the Disciples feet*, and his express Command, that they should wash every one anothers feet. To which he answereth, *John Brown* hath shewed disparity; And that R: B: saith meer nothing, but calleth him a *Pope*. This every Man that will be at the pains to read the place, will find to be a gross untruth, but this is ordinary.

His next in page 234. Where he citeth *Acts* 20. 7. to prove that the circumstances are not to be observed: The words (it seems) are, when the Disciples came together to break Bread, *Paul* preached unto them, and therefore say our Adversaries, *This was a Sacramental Eating, & no circumstance*

to

to be obſerved. A ſingular Conſequence and well worthy our Author; May he alwayes diſpute thus againſt us; And 1 *Cor:* 11. 18, 20. I deſire he may tell us next what relation it hath to his matter.

In the next place he begins with *Acts* 2. 42. And complains that R: B: denyes this to be meant of the *LORDS Supper.* But herein he accuſeth *Beza* who in his notes upon this place, ſaith, *The Jews uſed thinn Loaves, and therefore they did rather break them then cut them.* So by breaking of Bread they underſtand that living together, and the Banquets which they uſed to keep. The Reader may ſee what trouble it is to trace him to no purpoſe.

But he cometh again to *Acts* 20. 7. And ſaith *R: B:* ſlighteth his Adverſaries Reaſon; Which is another groſs Lie, as the Reader may ſee, *Vind:* page 172. But why doth he not bring ſome thing to help his Brother

ther? and not tell us he hath done all; When all Intelligent and Unbyaſſed Men judge he hath done more hurt then Good to his own Cauſe; And yet this Section is nothing but a meer *Elogie* upon J: B's: Book.

In Anſwer to *Numb*: 20. Saith our Author, *R*: *B*: *bringeth nothing but meer Aſſertions, falſe Suppoſitions, ſuch as that the Corinthians were ſupperſtitious, in that they at all practiſed this Duty of the LORDS Supper.*

I acknowledge he muſt be ſharper ſighted then I, who can ſee theſe words in *R*: *B*'s: *Vindication*, upon *Numb*: 20. or any where elſe. But being near the cloſe, he begins to Dream again, and may perhaps be *Simon* next, becauſe he was *Patroclus* laſt, and ſure he is more like the firſt, for Lying and Deceit is the beſt part of his work.

To *R*: *B*'s: Saying, That 1 *Cor*: 11. 26, Is to be underſtood of *Chriſts Inward and Spiritual Coming*, *Apol*: page

page 341, and his *Vind*: page 173, He giveth no Anſwer; But it is needleſs at all to impugne this diſtinction, its own groundleſneſs ſufficiently doth it.

This is like a mighty Man, and well worthy a *Græcian Hero.*

And now he is come to his *ultimus conatus*, which (he muſt excuſe me to tell him) is of all his Book the moſt ridiculous. For to conclude from the Abrogation of Rites, Signs, and Ceremonies, *That preaching the Goſpel was alſo abrogate.* To prove this, he ſaith, it will as well follow from *Col*: 2. 20. That preaching the Goſpel is abrogate, as from *verſe* 16. and *Rom*: 14. 17. That the *LORDS Supper* is abrogate. I ſhall therefore ſet down the Words, and leave it to the Judgement of the Reader, *Rom*: 14. 17. *For the Kingdom of GOD is not meat and drink, but Righteouſneſs, and Peace, and Joy in the Holy Ghoſt.* Col: 2. 16. *Let no Man therefore judge you*

i

in meat or in drink or in reſpect of an Holy Day, or of the new Moon, or of the Sabbath Dayes.

I ſhall now add his Citation for abrogating of preaching, *Col:* 2. 20. *Wherefore if ye be dead with CHRIST from the Rudiments of the World, why as tho living in the World are ye ſubject unto Ordinances? Touch not, Taſte not, &c.*

Now if the LORDs Supper as uſed by you, be not Meat and Drink, I know nothing what Bread and Wine are. But what a Commentary will this 20. verſe need to cauſe it intend preaching of the Goſpel? I remember the *Presbyterian Dialect* was wont to run thus; To hear Sermon, was called a Haunting of the Ordinances; And to abſtaine, was called a diſhaunting of the Ordinances: And therefore it ſeems he underſtands the word Ordinances in the 20. verſe for Preaching. He muſt ſhew us, what relation Preaching hath to the following

ing words, *Touch not, Taſte not, &c.* And clear his Inference before he boaſt ſo confidently.

Poſt-Script.

I Intended here to have Summed up his Extravagancies, and repreſented them to his Brethren: But when I conſidered what Juſtice *R: B:* met vvith, in the like Caſe, I reſolved to forbear.

I ſhall give one only Inſtance, vvhereby the Reader may have a taſte of the Malice and Injuſtice of our Adverſaries.

Robert Barkclays Vindication, page 195, *George Keiths* Poſition, vvhich *John Brown* and *Robert Macquair,* tvvo emi-

eminent *Presbyterian Preachers* in the Index at the end of *John Browns* Book, affirm to be one of the abominable heads of *Quakeriſm.* Is,

That the Man CHRIST JESUS is the Mediator, The Apoſtle his aſſertion (1 *Tim*: 25.) *Is,*

That there is one Mediator between GOD and Man, The Man CHRIST JESUS.

" We deſire [addeth he] the Senſe " and Cenſure of the *Presbyterian Mi-* " *niſtry* upon this: Or othervviſe vve " hope they cannot in reaſon be of- " fended, if juſtly reputed Accuſers " of the Spirit of GOD, that taught " the Apoſtles to ſpeak, and thence " be condemned as ſignal Calumnia- " tors and Hereticks.

Thus R. B. But in ſtead of any cenſure, or ſo much as a confeſſion of this horrid abomination. Behold our Author *Patroclus* appears on the ſtage, ſome

ſometimes like a Petulant and wanton Gallant, with a laſcivious Fable in his mouth; And anone he is quite transformed into a right *Hypocentaur*, and breaths nothing but Blood, Terrour and Deſolation, pulling down Caſtles, overturning Fabricks, and cutting Juglar Veins; Yet never forgets to extoll his brother *I. B.* And now and then to give us Paneygrick upon the mighty Acts performed by his Exorbitant *Blatant Ribaldry*, which is indeed all the Juſtice we can expect from that Generation.

His Appendix I am not concerned with, being (as he ſaith) written againſt one *Parker*, whom he calls an *Enthuſiaſtick Armenian*; This name to ſome of his Hearers may ſerve for Goſpel to conjure the devil, but I will Engliſh it for them: *It ſignifies a man inſpired of GOD, who believes the Doctrines of Iames Arminius.* I know no Men in this Nation who are under that denomination: But if I could find

one

one truely ſuch, I would prefer his Converſation to all the *Presbyterians* in the World, that deny the *inſpiration* of the *Almighty*, and tell us that *Chriſt ſpoke his laſt words to his Church* 1600 *years ago*: If he be alive, he will eaſily anſwer for himſelf, if not, I hope his Brethren will vindicat him.

To conclude the Presbyterian Doctrine is, *That the Decrees of GOD are Eternal Purpoſe, according to the Counſel of His own Will, whereby for His own Glory he hath foreordained whatſoever comes to paſs.* According to which Doctrine, it is manifeſt, that all the Actions, Words, and Thoughts of Men are neceſſary, and that it is impoſſible for them to do, think, or ſpeak any otherwayes then they do.

And therefore I hope *Patroclus* and his Brethren cannot in Reaſon be offended at me, for any thing I have writen in this Treatiſe, ſeeing, according to their own Doctrine, I was under an invincible neceſſity to write this

this, and no otherwiſe; Nor was it poſſible for me to forbear one Letter thereof. And GOD open their eyes to ſee the Tendency of theſe wicked Principles, and their Black and Bloody Practiſes which flow from them; that they may find Repentance and Mercy in the Day of the LORD JESUS.

THE END.

Account of the moſt Matterial Errors in Printing, that any wayes marr the ſenſe; Hoping the Candid Reader will paſs by, and excuſe ſmaller Literal faults, or wrong pointing: Conſidering our continued difficulty in Printing, through the unjuſt malice of our Adverſaries, leſt their ſlanders and our Innocencie ſhould be manifeſted.

Page 1: *Line* 13: *for* aucupunt *Read* aucupant. *page* 3: *line* 1: *for* Clericus *Read* Clericum. *page* 4. *line* 21: *for* His *read* This. *p*: 5 *l*: 22 *for* Isr. It is. *p*: 7 *l*: 14 *for* rom himſelf *read* By himſelf. *ib.l*: 19 *for* Auxibare r. Auxiliarie. *l*. 28. *for* is then *read* is there. *p*. 9: *l*: 2. *for* attendance *read* a tendancy. *ib. l*: 16: *for* departed *read* have departed. *l*. 23. *for* thy *read* they. *l*. 25 *for* have as *read* as have. *l*: 29 *for* caſts *read* caſt. *p*: 10 *l*: 15 *for* ambilton *read* the ambition. *ib. read* avarice. *p*. 13 *l* 23 *for* proxmoity *read* proximity. *lb.l*. 24 *for* paſſions *read* patrons. *p*. 15 *l*: 4 *for* Hicks I repreſen *read* Hicks repreſent. *ib*: *l*. 18 *for* this *read* his. *p*. 23 *l*. 2 *for* for *read* or. *p*. 27 *l*. 5 *for* or his *read* he or his. *p*. 30 *l*. 23 *for* added *read* had added. *p*. 33 *l*. 17 *for* in theſe *read* placed in theſe. *p*. 35 *l*. 18 *for* word *read* words *p*: 37 *l*. 19 *for* an *read* any *p*. 39 *l*. 2 *for* this the *read* this is the. *ib*. *l*. 12 *for* cannot *read* can. *p*. 40 *l*. 8 *for* the good *read* to the good *p*. 42 *l*. 5 *for* veleſiers *read* vilifiers. *p*: 47 *l*. 8 *read but once*, nor any outward audible voice. *ib*. *l* 9 *for* fifthly *read* fourthly. *l*. 10 *for* ſixthly *read* fifthly. *p*. 48 *l*. 6 *for* act *read* art. *p*. 57 *l*. 27 *for* Chapter *read* Chapter II. *p*. 67 *l*. 11 *for* proveth that *read* proveth indeed. *p*. 73 *l*. 22 *for* boaſtings *read* boaſting. *p*. 81 *l*. 22 *for* metempychoſis *read* Metempſychoſis. *p*. 86 *l*. 22 *for* comes *read* he comes. *p*. 89 *l*. 18 *for* any *read* an. *p*. 90 *l*. 11 *for* ſaid ſo *read* had ſaid ſo. *ib*. *l*. 28 *for* the *read* is. *p*. 91 *l*. 4 *for* what *read* whom. *p* 103 *l*. 23 *for* then *read* them. *p*. 112 *l*. 17 *for* Acylogie *read* Acyrologie. *p*. 116 *l*. 18 *for* then the Scriptures *read* then the ſame things. *p*. 118 *l*. 23 *for* this my *read* this is my. *p*. 121 *l*. 12 *for* when *read* then. *p*. 122 *l*. 7 *for* 100 *read* A. *p*. 128 *l*. 24 *for* it *read* is

s. *p.* 129 *l.* 4 *for* muſt do obey *read* muſt obey. *p.* 132 *l.* 28 *for* Defamation *read* Deformation. *p.* 139 *l.* 4 *for* if any *read* if in any. *p.* 154 *l.* 9 *for* hard Scriptures *read* Scriptures. *ib. l.* 10 *for* were heard *read* were hard. *p.* 157 *l.* 18 *for* in any *read* many. *p.* 159 *l.* 19 *for* repreſent *read* repreſent nothing. *p.* 162 *l.* 28 *for* Miencer *read* Muncer. *p.* 163 *l.* 18 *for* Hi *read* Hic. *p.* 166 *l.* 5 *for* urged *read* verged. *p.* 193 *l.* 21 *for* to Salvation *read* Salvation. *p.* 207 *l.* 20 *for* it could *read I* could. *p.* 209 *l.* 14 *for* natural man *read* natural to Man. *p.* 217 *l.* 24 *for* which ſavingly *read* is ſavingly. *p.* 223 *l.* 23 *for* is dead *read* is not dead. *p.* 225 *l.* 8 *for* Apoſtolick *read* Apologetick. *p.* 226 *l.* 24 *for* Warr *read* Tower. *p.* 233 *l.* 9 *for* will more *read* he will more. *p.* 246 *l.* 12 *for* Auſtuſtine *read* Auguſtine. *p.* 250 *l.* 27 *for* regated *read* regarded. *p.* 252 *l.* 23 *for* whither *read* where. *p.* 254 *l.* 12 *for* guilty to come *read* guilty. *p.* 256 *l.* 26 *for* propone in it *read* propone it. *p.* 268 *l.* 1 *for* dicats *read* dictats. *p.* 269 *l.* 10 *for* Man *read* the Devil. *p.* 271 *l.* 2 *for* upon the Presbyterian Eloquence *read* upon the credit of the Presbyterian Eloquence. *p.* 273 *l.* 15 *for* oweſt *read* owneſt. *p.* 275 *l.* 20 *for* uſed to *read* uſed to do. *p.* 278 *l.* 21 *for* created as man *read* Created by CHRIST as Man. *p.* 286 *l.* 22 *for* contemns *read* continues. *p.* 289 *l.* 13 *for* niomerical *read* numerical. *p.* 295 *l.* 11 *for* to grow *read* is the way to grow. *p.* 302 *l.* 19 *for* proceedeth *read* preceedeth. *p.* 306 *l.* 4 *for* this as *read* this a. *ib. l.* 16 *for* their *read* here. *p.* 308 *l.* 26 *for* will GOD *read* Will of GOD. *p.* 309 *l.* 20 *for* were a mind *read* were not a mind. *p.* 313 *l.* 12 *for* dark *read* daily. *ib. l.* 15 *for* there two *read* theſe two. *p.* 322 *l.* 19 *for* but ſhews *read* but he ſhews. *p.* 324 *l.* 1 *for* thus *read* this: *p.* 329 *l.* 13 *for* hinder of that *read* hinder that. *p.* 338 *l.* 24: *for* but *read* nixi. *p.* 339 *l.* 25 *for* Schitian *read* Schithian. *p.* 340 *l.* 4 *for* to thing *read* to the thing. *ib. l.* 5 *for* as well *read* as well as. *p.* 346 *l.* 19 *for* becauſe our *read* becauſe forſooth our. *p.* 350 *l.* 5 *for* coming CHRIST *read* coming of CHRIST. *p.* 354 *l.* 2 *for* it at leaſure *read* not at leiſure. *p.* 355 *l.* 20 *for* as acceſſory *read* as a neceſſary. *p.* 361 *l.* 5 *for* where he *read* where he ſaith. *p.* 362 *l.* 3 *for* lie great *read* great lie. *p.* 364 *l.* 12 *for* reducable *read* deduceable. *p.* 373 *l.* 10 *for* Paneygrick *read* Panegyrick. *ib. l.* 20 *for* Goſpel *read* a Spell. *p.* 374 *l.* 11 *for* Eternal purpoſe *read* his Eternal Purpoſe.